

ALEXANDER DUGIN

~ ARTICLES ~

VOLUME 1



BERSERKER
BOOKS



Aleksander Dugin: I am waiting for Ivan the Terrible

- Students of the Diplomatic Academy in Moscow, whom I spoke with, told me that the reading they were given during the classes, i.e. your book *Fundamentals of Geopolitics*, was the most remembered by the chapter devoted to sacred geography. In Poland, I have not met anyone who would deal with this issue. Could you please tell us what place Poland occupies in sacred geography?

- I have never dealt specifically with the case of Poland, although its place is very specific. After all, this is the north of Eurasia, an important pre-Christian Slavic region, the Baltic Sea basin. Regarding the archetypes of sacred geography, I would like to point out two things.

First of all: in the Orthodox reality there is a synergy between the pre-Christian and Christian world models, which overlap homologously, without conflicts. Different figures and phenomena from different orders overlap painlessly and even harmoniously. In the case of Poland, there is a much more conflicting relationship between these two models, and this is due to Catholicism, which is a tradition completely different from that of Orthodoxy. René Guenon clearly separates tradition from religion. Tradition is a broader concept than religion. Orthodoxy is a tradition, Catholicism is a religion. Tradition is able to absorb elements of other religious beliefs without conflict. Religion, on the other hand, comes into conflict with other beliefs. It is related to a different historical experience of the Eastern and Western Churches after the Great Schism. For the West was not always purely religious, Catholic, there was a period when it was more traditional, Orthodox. After the great schism, however, Catholicism departed from tradition and narrowed down to religion. This, at least, is our Byzantine version.

How does this relate to sacred geography? In our understanding, the West, understood as a territory where Catholicism and Protestantism dominate, is in an opposite relationship to religious norms and elements. Of course, there are many elements of other religions in the West, but they conflict with the Catholic religion. Institutions that deal with sacred geography or the remnants of pre-Christian traditions in the West, after the Great Schism, were relegated to autonomous spheres - to magic, esotericism, hermetic orders. In Orthodoxy, such a split did not take place.

In this context, Poland is on the border between the Catholic and Orthodox worlds. From my Eurasian point of view, the archetype of Poland's sacred geography is deeply dualistic: on the one hand, it is a pre-Christian, pagan, magical, heterodox tradition whose roots remain Slavic; on the other - German-

Roman Catholicism. There is a conflict between them. The situation of Poland is a borderline one. She cannot unite with the eastern world religiously, and with the western world ethnically. In geopolitics, Poland remains part of the sanitary cordon separating the Eurasian continent into two parts, which is very convenient for the Anglo-Saxon anti-traditional forces. Poland cannot fully realize its Eurasian-Slavic essence, because it is hindered by Catholicism, nor its Western European identity, because it is hindered by its own Slavic character, ie language, customs, archetypes, climate of places, etc. As a result of this duality, this extreme situation, Poland always falls victim to the third force, as is the case with mondialism or Atlantism today. Due to this location on the border between Russia and Germany, there will always be the problem of the partitions of Poland between the East and the West in history. It is the result of this sacral-geographic and geopolitical duality. As Toynbee noted, the attempt to build an independent Polish-Lithuanian civilization between the two forces ended in failure. Central European civilization is too weak to withstand the tension between East and West. The countries of this region have to define themselves: either here or there. Polish-Lithuanian civilization did not want or could not define itself, therefore she had to disappear. It is indeed a dramatic situation.

- Are there any elements in the Polish tradition that you find attractive?

- I am much closer to the Slavic-Eurasian sources of Polishness, their ethnic and even pagan elements. I am attracted to certain eastern or oriental elements, minority culture. I think that the best thing in Polish history is the Jewish tradition in small towns in eastern Poland. Actually, I am interested in everything that was anti-Catholic in Poland: Polish freemasons and occultists, Jan Potocki and Hoene-Wroński, Mienżyński and Dzerzhinsky ... They all chose the Eurasian path.

- You are talking about the position of Poland between the East and the West, that is, between Russia and Germany. Meanwhile, many scholars emphasize the greater similarity of Germany, and especially Prussia, to Russia than to England or Spain. Feliks Koneczny even believed that Prussia, like Russia, belonged to the Byzantine and not Latin civilization.

Koneczny was right. Germany is internally divided. Bavaria tends to the West, Prussia to the East. Prussia is such a small Russia inside Germany.

- We have always seen it as the greatest danger for us: a friendly alliance between Germany and Russia.

- That's our job. Unite with Germany and create a powerful continental bloc.

- What about Poland then?

- We Russians and Germans understand in terms of expansion and we will never reason otherwise. We are not simply interested in preserving our own state or nation. We are interested in absorbing, through the pressure we exert, the maximum number of categories that complement us. We are not interested in colonizing like the English, but in drawing our strategic geopolitical boundaries without even special Russification, although there should be some Russification. Russia, in its geopolitical and sacred-geographic development, is not interested in the existence of an independent Polish state in any form. It is also not interested in the existence of Ukraine. Not because we don't like Poles or Ukrainians, but because these are the laws of sacred geography and geopolitics.

Poland has to choose: either Slavic or Catholic identity. I understand it's hard to separate one from the other, but it's inevitable. Hitler also could not fight on two fronts, he had to choose: either with England against Russia or with Russia against England, as Haushofer advised him. But Hitler did not want to choose. "I don't want to tear myself apart, I want to remain myself," he said, and started a war on two fronts. It plunged Germany, 20 million Russians, and a good chunk of the world. For what? That McDonalds would now open their bars in Berlin, that the Soviet Union would collapse and that NATO soldiers were stationed everywhere. The identity of Germany was so important to Hitler at the time that he did not want to make a choice. In the same way, Poland has to choose, identity is not important. If Poland insists on keeping its identity,

There are nations that can expand to the size of civilization. They then lose their identity, race, and sometimes even language, but that is a risk to be taken if you want to be an empire. This is the United States, this is Russia. Poland was unable to create its own civilization and must make a choice. I think there is still a possibility for you to make your normal choice, i.e. Byzantine. It requires a lot of courage, nonconformity, unusual forms of action, some skinheads, anarchists, mystics. Polish chaos against the Polish order.

[end_page]

- In a word, from your point of view, all anti-Catholic activities in Poland are beneficial?

- Exactly. You have to break Catholicism from the inside, strengthen Polish Freemasonry, support decaying secular movements, promote heterodox and anti-papal Christianity. Catholicism cannot be absorbed into our tradition unless it is deeply reoriented in a nationalist and anti-papal direction. If

there was a lodge in Poland like the Irish Golden Dawn, whose leaders, for example William Butler Yeats or Maud Gonne, on the one hand were Catholics, and on the other - fanatical occultists inspired by Celtic culture, then one might have some hope. Such people could decompose Catholicism from within and reorient it towards a more heterodox and even esoteric direction. Anyway, my friends in Poland tell me that there are groups with you that are related to telemism or the achievements of Alistair Crowley.

- To be honest, the more widespread opinion is that if there are forces decomposing Catholicism in Poland, they are closer to the West than the East.

- As I said, you are between two clashing blocks, two civilization concepts: Eurasianism and Atlantism, which wants to create a New World Order, that is a civilization devoid of tradition, sacrum, metaphysics.

- If this is how the New World Order is presented in Poland, it is almost always added that only Catholicism can be a salvation from total secularization.

- Catholicism cannot be a guarantee of defense against the New World Order, because it is a transition stage to this order. I do not believe in such an evolution and such a mutation of Catholicism that it could acquire a Eurasian character. What can we hide a lot ... I am not like Ziuganow, who promises every lame orphan on the road something pleasant. Poland is in a tragic geopolitical situation. Both they (ie the New World Order) and we (Eurasians) want to deprive you of your Catholicism. Our offer is better, however, because with us you will at least be able to develop and realize your Slavic identity. So the less influential the pro-Eastern forces in the anti-Catholic lobby, the more tragic your situation becomes. I hope, however, that there will be forces gravitating towards Eurasianism, maybe there will be some synthesis between the extreme right and the extreme left. It is a pity that communism in Poland has never been esoteric, as it has in Russia ...

- Before the war, in the KPP there was actually only one significant representative of mystical-Gnostic communism, Jan Hempel, the author of the Volkist Piast Sermons in the spirit.

- Perhaps, then, higher hopes should be placed on your extreme right. If your national current broke away from liberalism and turned towards paganism, it would naturally gravitate towards the East. There was, after all, the phenomenon of the anti-Catholic and pagan "Zadruga" before the war.

- What you say reminds me of what I read recently about Russian Christianity. Some historians of religion believe that Russia was never completely Christianized, that Christianity was adopted very superficially, and pagan beliefs and customs were still alive among the majority of the common people.

- It all depends on what we call Christianity. Orthodoxy and Christianity are two different things. When you say "Christianity", you mean Catholicism or something analogous to Catholicism. Meanwhile, Orthodoxy is defined as non-Catholicism. So if Catholicism is Christianity, then Orthodoxy is non-Christian. Conversely, if we are Christians, you are not. I rely not only on the claims of our fathers after the Great Schism, but also on the eighth and ninth-century authorities such as Photius. Orthodoxy, which is not a religion but a tradition, is much closer to what we call paganism. It embraces and includes paganism. The teaching of the Cappadocian Fathers or the Palamites does not come into total conflict with pagan norms, but only transforms pre-Christian archetypes in Orthodox contexts. Orthodoxy is more than a religion, both vertically, because it includes paganism, and horizontally, because it is open to metaphysics, which has completely disappeared in post-school Catholicism. Orthodoxy and Catholicism are two completely separate phenomena, tradition and religion are like a whole and a part. Therefore, it is not possible to unite Orthodoxy and Catholicism.

- Specialists in ecumenical dialogue emphasize that between Catholicism and Protestantism, cultural and civilization differences are minimal, but dogmatically there is a gap between them. The situation is different with Catholicism and Orthodoxy: dogmatic differences are small, while cultural and civilizational differences are huge.

- Werner Sombarth, developing the theses of Max Weber, stated that at the source of capitalism was not only Protestantism, but also Catholicism. Catholicism with its filioque and the idea of individual salvation. The idea of individual salvation is not a Christian thought, but typically Catholic. There is no such concept in Orthodoxy. There is no concept of a unit at all. In Orthodox anthropology the word individual does not appear. As we know, anthropology builds the entire social system, the entire civilization model. Sombarth believed that Catholic anthropology assumed a specific development of socio-economic relations because it attached great importance to the concept of individuality. Orthodox anthropology, in turn, always emphasized the supra-individual personality. Man then sees himself as part of a larger whole. Therefore, he does not save himself, but someone saves through him. In Catholicism, man is an individual, and therefore an indivisible whole, in Orthodoxy, a man is a dividual, an individual, and therefore divisible. In Catholicism, man is a finite being, he is responsible for himself - to God, to people, etc. Protestantism has made this conviction even more holistic. In Orthodoxy, on the other hand, man is part of the Church, part of the community organism, just like a leg. So how can a person be responsible for himself? Can the leg be responsible for itself? This is where the idea of the state, the total state, comes from. Therefore, the Russians, being Orthodox, can be true fascists, unlike artificial Italian fascists like Gentile or the Hegelians there. True Hegelianism is Ivan Peresvietov - a man

who in the 16th century he invented an oprichnina for Ivan the Terrible. It was the real founder of Russian fascism. He formulated the thesis that the state is everything and the individual is nothing. The state is salvation, the state is the Church. It is enough to read the writings of our Orthodox saint, Józef of Wołokołamsk, to see that these two organisms are identical, identical. And now this whole organism for salvation, all strive for salvation without crumbling, like one collective soul, one collective body.

[end_page]

- Indeed, in Orthodoxy you have a certain inclination towards apocatastasis, towards the idea of universal salvation ...

- That's true. The most important thing is that we have no individuality. The individual dissolves into the collective. This is how the Russian works for salvation.

- Whose salvation?

- The salvation of the archetype, the salvation of Adam. Through the state, the Russians are striving not to save themselves, but Adam ...

- Adam Kadmon, that sounds cabbalistic.

- No, this is a holistic approach. In Orthodoxy, it is about the salvation of the Old Testament Adam through the coming of the new Adam, i.e. Christ, nature, while nature is saved through people. The state, especially the holy state, is the instrument of this salvation. That is why the Russian Tsar is an active participant in the mystery of soteriology. After the fall of Byzantium, he became the last guardian of the catechon, a tradition that Charlemagne turned out to be usurper at the turn of the 8th and 9th centuries. After all, it was the Byzantine emperor who was the true emperor of both East and West.

- I have heard the claim that the real split between East and West took place not in 1054 when the Great Schism occurred, nor in 1204 when the Crusaders ravaged Constantinople, but on Christmas 800 when Pope Leo III he put an imperial crown on the head of Charlemagne.

- It was a usurpation. Therefore, the imperial function of the West, whether under the Stauffenbergs or the Habsburgs, always remained questionable. Because an ecumen can only have one emperor. One of them must be false. By all the norms of orthodoxy, such a sacred, anointed figure, regardless of any negative personal character traits, was the Byzantine emperor, and after the fall of Constantinople, the Russian Tsar. It can be said that all Western philosophy and culture arose from rejecting and ignoring the Byzantine tradition. In the West, the Orthodox version of Christianity or metaphysics is not taken into account at all, it is treated as if it did not exist.

- I think that if the process of increasing separation between Catholicism and Orthodoxy in the last millennium, it was a two-sided process. Orthodoxy also isolated itself from Catholicism.

- That's right, but the point is, only one side can be right. If Catholicism is right, then neither Russia nor Serbia have any *raison d'être*, culture should be Americanized and Protestant, because this is the right direction of development. After all, Protestantism is a child of Catholicism, disgusting, I admit, and filthy, but legitimate. So if Orthodoxy is wrong, then one should choose the Protestant way and, as in the Church of England, vote that there is no hell. The right, however, is on the side of Orthodoxy, which remains the most perfect form of traditionalism, sacredness and conservatism. In the beginning, there was East and West. The East is paradise, the fullness, the West is exile, nothingness. Eastern empire - legitimate, western - apostatic. These aren't just archetypes. There is a great struggle between Byzantium and Rome, Russia and the West, Eurasianism and Atlantism, Socialism and Capitalism, Barbarism and Civilization. We do not represent civilization, but culture. We all - Russians, Serbs, Tatars, etc. - represent the barbarian element. Barbarism is life, it is the sacred world of tradition. We live in shacks, beat the drums, drink vodka, and we are attacked by Daniel Bell, postmodernism, post-Protestant information society, the New World Order. In this great clash of Atlantic civilization and Eurasian culture, everything that lies between us - Poland, Ukraine, Central Europe, and who knows, maybe even Germany - must disappear, be absorbed. - we represent the barbarian element. Barbarism is life, it is the sacred world of tradition. We live in shacks, beat the drums, drink vodka, and we are attacked by Daniel Bell, postmodernism, post-Protestant information society, the New World Order. In this great clash of Atlantic civilization and Eurasian culture, everything that lies between us - Poland, Ukraine, Central Europe, and who knows, maybe even Germany - must disappear, be absorbed. - we represent the barbarian element. Barbarism is life, it is the sacred world of tradition. We live in shacks, beat the drums, drink vodka, and we are attacked by Daniel Bell, postmodernism, post-Protestant information society, the New World Order. In this great clash of Atlantic civilization and Eurasian culture, everything that lies between us - Poland, Ukraine, Central Europe, and who knows, maybe even Germany - must disappear, be absorbed.

- Samuel Huntington in his Clash of Civilizations writes that states that are hybrids of two civilizations have no chance of surviving in the shape they are today; that Bosnia, Ukraine, Turkey and Mexico will eventually have to take sides. Huntington's comments, however, did not apply to Poland or Germany.

Huntington is right: a clash of civilizations is imminent. There is no room for countries in the middle. I have already talked about Poland. And Germany? What can Germany do? After all, this is an occupied country. The Germans missed their chance during the war. We had to fight with us against England, turn the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact to the West, and then Hitler-Stalin forever. Today, instead of English, Russian and German would be spoken everywhere. The Germans did not go for it and lost. Now there is an American occupation and such "murder" that even your mouth cannot be opened. I do hope, however, that Germany will shake off this state of affairs and shed its dependency sooner or later. I am convinced that in the common Eurasian home there will be room for Germans, Poles, French and Italians. We, the Russians, will impose only a barbaric, sacred attitude to life on the whole of Eurasia, and how it will be manifested in a particular nation will depend on our own national predispositions. I see Poles, for example, as defenders of Slavic racism. The Slavic element always breaks down the frames of individualism, strives for community.

- You say so much about community, collectivity, but in fact you are an individualist.

- How's that? Why? How do you think so?

- Even here, in the premises of the National-Bolshevik Party, it is enough to look around to see that they all look the same in their black uniforms, they even have a similar facial expression, only the Lord differs significantly from them.

- I'm just like them. I don't think about myself, I think about others. I don't think for myself, I think for others. There are two concepts: personalism and individualism. Individualism is the opposite of community, because the center of the world, a constitutive element of the worldview, becomes the human individual, the individual. There is no place for community or holism here, there is only rational, logical, relative agreement between individual individuals. What, in turn, do we propose? We are not against the person, but for understanding them supra-individually. This is, in a sense, the Nietzschean idea. Man is a dynamic phenomenon, constantly overcoming himself. This overcoming means the growth of man, growth beyond the limits of his individuality. In the vertical dimension, a person then becomes a part of a community, an organ of a certain organism. On the other hand, in the horizontal dimension ... someone has to think. Together you cannot think, you can act together. If you mix them all

together, then the head of this collective organism that will arise will not be the sum of the individual brains, but one brain, the most enlightened one. There must be a certain gnoseological hierarchy. This communality of material unity, the horizontal unity of bodies, contains within itself a hierarchy. Often times, people who fight against individualism are personalists. The spirit of unity, the spirit of community and the spirit of the nation can be manifested in them in a very condensed way. They are not individualists, but separate, discrete incarnations of the all-unity. This is their authority. This is the idea of a monarch, a people's chief, a Führer. This is a phenomenon of the Russian tsars, but also of Pugachev, Lenin and Stalin. And it's not like that at all that some individualist invents collectivism, because then he would be a fraud, a charlatan, a hypnotist. It is like in chemistry: when different substances are mixed together, the lightest ones, i.e. the gases, float up the highest. Similarly in society: when different human elements are mixed together, the most subtle ones, i.e. the brains, are at the top. Therefore, for some, this idea of community is concentrated in the brain, in others in the soul, and in others in the legs or hands. Nevertheless, it is the same idea for everyone. In this way, one organism is created - Behemoth (as Carl Schmitt would call him), the Eurasian Tatar-Scythian monster, which includes not only people, but also elements, elements of nature, soil, winds, rivers, mountains. The sublimation of this terrible dark cluster is the Russian monarchs, Stalin ...

- You said that Russia's internal imperative is expansion. But what is the purpose of this expansion, what is the idea behind the postulated ideocracy?

- The goal of the Russian expansion is total soteriological science. We have felt it for centuries, since the time of Metropolitan Ilarion of Kiev, but now it is more obvious than ever that we are not a nation among many, but that we have a mission to reveal a truth to the world. We want a different end to history than the one proposed by the West. We want a sacred end, not a profane end. We are convinced, and we live it, that we have a certain key to spiritual, eschatological truth. Every Russian knows it. Everyone.

[end_page]

- What is the essence of this truth?

- Our entire thousand-year history is an attempt to reveal this truth, to look for forms of its expression. It is the truth that the West has plunged into its depths, it is the truth about salvation, the transformation of the world, a new pleroma, a new quality of being, resurrection from the dead, the transformation of bodies, the sunlight that should come from the lips of the Great Mother. We Russians, due to our ethnic

and religious predispositions, are called to do so. Our entire history, including the last battle of communism against capitalism, are just different attempts to pursue the same messianic dream.

- To tell the truth, it is somehow difficult for me to imagine communism as a fight for the sacred in the world. Especially in the times of Stalin, so praised by Lord Stalin, it was a deeply anti-Orthodox movement: churches were demolished and closed, bishops were tortured and murdered, the faithful were imprisoned and sent to Siberia, forced atheization was carried out ...

- First: it was the Orthodoxy that Stalin was destroying that was very incidental - imbued with the spirit of the West, alienated from the nation. Second: the messianic dream I mentioned could live outside Orthodoxy and develop in other forms. Communism was an attempt to liberate this messianism from a purely religious understanding. Perhaps this attempt failed precisely because it was so distant from theology. So I think that in the next expansion we should use all our experiences, both purely sacred and socialist. Socialism is nothing more than a secularized version of Byzantineism, it is Red Byzantium, Orthodoxy in a sectarian, exalted form. It can be said that the people's monarch Stalin, with the people's faith, that is, communism, came out against the alienated, lordly, noble, of the occidentalized monarchy and the Orthodox Church. I am not such an ardent supporter of the Stalinist system, but I can clearly see the pulsation of our historical existence also in communism. So if I say my unconditional "yes" to Bolshevism, Lenin and Stalin, it is not because it was an ideal system, but because it was the only solution for us. This time we have not succeeded yet, but the next time we will purify Orthodoxy and communism and we will reject those elements that caused these models to alienate themselves from the nation. Our next stage will be Orthodox communism - Eurasian, missionary, pan-Slavic, philotatar ... So if I say my unconditional "yes" to Bolshevism, Lenin and Stalin, it is not because it was an ideal system, but because it was the only solution for us. This time we have not succeeded yet, but the next time we will purify Orthodoxy and communism and we will reject those elements that caused these models to alienate themselves from the nation. Our next stage will be Orthodox communism - Eurasian, missionary, pan-Slavic, philotatar ...

- It almost sounds like a postmodern project.

- We include a lot, but also exclude a lot. We exclude individualism, the individual, the free market, worldview neutrality, tolerance, and we include barbaric, fanatic and exalted elements. This is not

postmodernism, but let's say postmodern. Postmodern is the objective state in which we live after the victory of the West over us. Modern is over. Postmodernism is just one answer to the postmodern challenge, the liberal answer. There may also be an anti-liberal response, that is ours - postmodern anti-postmodernism. The reflection of the West breaks down everything into prime factors, while at the same time sterilizing everything and drying it up like exhibits in a flowerbed. Our reflection does not deprive us of the aroma of life, even erotic delight with our ideas, it makes us drunk, we are drunk with Eurasia ...

- As early as the 18th century, Nikita Panin described the history of Russia as a polar pulsation of deadness and chaos. Similarly, two centuries later, Yuri Lotman - as jumps in entropy and organization. Today's journalists often compare the present situation of Russia to the Weimar era in German history ...

- A very accurate comparison.

- The West is aware of this and that is why it does not want to humiliate the Russians, to humiliate their national pride, as it did to Germany after the First World War, when it drew huge contributions from them. Rather, the West wants to raise Russia's value, invites it to join the G-7 group, and pumps millions of dollars into the Russian economy. He wants to avoid the Weimar scenario ...

- The West treats Russia very severely. I think that he did not draw conclusions from the Weimar lesson, however. The more he puts pressure on us, the more he will have to pay for it. It works like a spring: the harder you push, the harder it will hit back. The West is geographic Satan, geographic Antichrist. The West should pay for everything. It would be best to settle it with Chinese, Tatars, Muslims, all this Eurasian nomadism. When I was walking down the streets of Paris recently, I suddenly noticed that I was missing something. And I realized it was odorless, sterile, aseptic. The only fragrance in the West is perfume. Earth, air, flowers, trees only started to smell in Poland, and when I returned to Russia, I plunged into the madness of smells. The West is dead land. It will only come back to life when the Cossacks settle it, Tajiks, Kazakhs. They will bring life with them, they will bring fragrances.

- You refer to the Orthodox tradition at almost every step. However, does Orthodoxy itself admit to your ideas? I talked to many representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow and none of them consider you an orthodox believer, you are considered rather a heretic.

- Who said that?

- For example, deacon Andrei Kurayev.

- And deacon Alexander Mumrikov said that I was fully Orthodox. And what? One deacon's sentence against the other's sentence. Fortunately, we do not have Catholicism, where there is the office of the Pope and everyone must obey it. I, too, can safely say that Deacon Kurayev is not fully Orthodox. There are currently two Orthodoxy: the first - living, full of spirit, and the second - official, formalized, and staff. Deacon Kurajew represents the formal, pro-systemic, I would say even profane branch of the Orthodox Church. He writes texts that are spiritually Catholic. For example, he believes that the merit of Christianity was the impetus to the development of exact sciences, which caused the desacralization of the cosmos. The Hesychasts would have hailed him as a heretic at once. Fortunately, Orthodoxy is wider than the Church itself, and also includes a branch of the Old Believers. I belong to the Moscow Patriarchate myself, but I am in spirit with the Old Believers. Besides, they consider themselves the only true Orthodox. If there is a real revival of Orthodoxy, it will come not from the ossified structures of the official Church, but from the depths of the Russian national spirit, which has been fully preserved among the Old Believers.

- And which branch of the Old Believers is closer to you? Circulars or non-circulars?

- This division applies to the Białokrynica hierarchy. On the other hand, I am more interested in another division: popowców and bezpopowców. I am closer to the poppers who reject priests as more radical. Among them, however, the closest to me is the faction of non-members who believe that the kingdom of Antichrist has already come, and that it is the Catholic and Protestant West.

- I can see that you have a very closed thought system. But what are the chances that the ideas you are preaching will find resonance in society? Observing the Lord, one can say: some haunted idealist is sitting in the basement, something is raving under his breath, but his fantasies have absolutely no effect on people. Oh, another frustration in our century ...

- I will try to answer this question in three steps. First of all, even if I am an idealist who sits in the basement and whose ideas play no role, it does not bother me because all the great ideas started with the idealists who sat in the basement and played no role. The fate of the idea is specific. A man who deals with ideas is immersed in a theurgical atmosphere where what is invisible and inaudible appears

to him as visible and audible, even in the form of a text or discourse. And even if I remained unknown to anyone until my death and did not leave any written words, what counts is the mere fact of capturing the main vectors of history, the main ideas of civilization.

Second: I am active in the National-Bolshevik Party. It is not a big party, but it has a clear focus: we especially try to influence young people, especially students, who will be the elite of the young generation in the future. We are, in fact, the only party that deals with the thoughts of young people. We teach them to think and live. We are concerned with the indoctrination of the next generation. Nobody in Russia does this: neither liberals nor communists ...

- Television does it.

- That's right, but she forms average and passive people. We, on the other hand, shape people, as Gumilev called them, passionate, above-average, those whom Pareto called counter-relatives of the future. Other nationalist parties, such as the Barkashists, do not form the counter-past of the past, but defensive troops. Their militant organizations are not elites of any kind. We, on the other hand, focus on those who will set the tone for life in Russia in the future, and we prepare them conceptually. We organize seminars for them, publish magazines and books. It can be said that our party is purely intellectual. All these pickets or demonstrations are only an addition to the basic task, which is the intellectual preparation of a generation. We already have hundreds of people formed this way across the country.

Third and finally: my ideas are not confined to the party itself. Since 1987, I have been actively involved in the ideologization of the broadly understood patriotic camp. The two largest parties in the present Duma - the communists of Zyuganov and the nationalists of Żyrynowski - took over from me, especially from my earlier texts, the main ideological and geopolitical thoughts. Many politicians, whom I did not even know personally, also referred to the ideas I put forward, for example General Liebież.

- Maybe because one of Liebież's advisers was Heydar Dżemal. In 1991, in your publishing house, you published the book *Orientacja: Północ*.

- Our paths with Dżemal diverged because his traditionalism and Eurasianism is Muslim, and mine - Russian. Returning, however, to the previous thread. It does not matter if I personally know Ruckoy or Khashbulatov, who adopt my ideas. I am like Ivan Pereswietov, who came up with an oprycznina for Ivan the Terrible. I am a thought lab. I don't think for myself, I think for the state, for the nation, for history. I'm waiting for my Ivan the Terrible. All politicians who will look for a real and great idea for Russia will come to me sooner or later. Not because I am a great individual and I personally came up with

something myself, but because there is an objective idea of Russia, and I am only its exponent. My latest book, *Fundamentals of Geopolitics*, is read by all opposition politicians and the more serious officials of the Yeltsin administration. The idea of the Moscow-Berlin-Paris axis, which Yeltsin spoke about recently, is directly taken from my writings. If Tokyo is added to that, it is a classic element of the Eurasian geopolitical concept. In addition, many circles in other former Soviet republics are interested in our ideas of a conservative revolution. For example, in Armenia, the group of Robert Kocharian, who came to power at the moment, the so-called the party of the war are people largely shaped in our writings. So to sum up: with or without me - what I am writing about, it will happen anyway. Who will be the subject, who will put these ideas into practice - I do not know and do not undertake to answer. Perhaps it will be the current government that will change its face, it may be some opposition force, it may happen in many years, but it is an inevitable process. I may disappear, but my geopolitical ideas will not disappear.

- It is often said about your environment that you are the Russian equivalent of the Western European New Right. This orientation, assuming that the battle for the fate of mankind would take place not in the political but in the cultural field, proclaimed a kind of Kulturkampf ...

- The Kulturkampf of the New Right is a wonderful idea, Alain de Benoist is a heroic activist and brilliant thinker, but their struggle for thirty years has brought no results. They said that culture would be the battlefield, while the Americanization made its greatest triumphs in culture. Right-wing gramscism is in a deplorable state, it has never gone beyond the margins. How to explain this? I think that the conceptual model of the New Right is very interesting, but the temperament of its European activists is insufficient to implement such ideas. They are too civilized, too conservative, too cowardly, such warm noodles. That's why I don't like comparing to them, because it's basically comparing to losers. Over the years of the opposition in Russia, I have done things that they never dreamed of. I was not concerned with the Kulturkampfem, but with the ideological fertilization of serious political forces. I've been working with living history, not archeology. The only man in the West whose breadth of views shocked me was Jean Thiriart, the author of the idea of the Euro-Soviet empire. Before his death, he even came to Moscow; I hosted him here, I introduced him to Jegor Ligaczow, to Ziuganow, Baburin ...

Europe today has a choice: Eurasianism or Atlanticism. Either he goes with Russia or with America. If the European New Right chooses us, that is, it chooses the barbaric element, and therefore must adopt our methods of operation. You have to organize attacks, deal with sabotage, set fire to, blow up bridges. True antimondialism is destruction and terror. What is the New Right doing? She turned into an intellectual sect. For thirty years, overweight, gray-haired men have been gathering at seminars and beating foam. Of course you have to read books, but that is not enough. You have to create a guerilla. If you are against the New World Order, then take a knife, put on a mask, go out in the evening and kill at least one yankie. That is why I am so close to the New Left, the Red Brigades and the Rote Armee Fraktion. Our task is not limited to culture, our task is to make a real revolution. Ideology and intellectual preparation are needed for this, but without concrete participation in the action, without front-line

experience, without combat baptism - it will remain unattainable for us. I do not know if any of the New Right activists were ever under artillery fire, but our people not only attend meetings or fight barricades, but also go to real wars, e.g. to Transnistria or Yugoslavia. The New Right is just a project, and we are designers and contractors, architects and builders. Our future is. Whether any of the New Right activists were once under artillery fire, but our people not only attend meetings or fight on barricades, but also go to real wars, e.g. to Transnistria or Yugoslavia. The New Right is just a project, and we are designers and contractors, architects and builders. Our future is. Whether any of the New Right activists were once under artillery fire, but our people not only attend meetings or fight on barricades, but also go to real wars, e.g. to Transnistria or Yugoslavia. The New Right is just a project, and we are designers and contractors, architects and builders. Our future is.

- Thank you for the conversation.

Interviewer: Grzegorz Górny

Moscow, March 1998

Aleksandr Dugin

Born Aleksandr Gelyevich Dugin

7 January 1962 (age 61)

Moscow, Russian SFSR, Soviet Union[1]

Education Moscow Aviation Institute (no degree)

Spouses

Evgenia Debryanskaya

Natalya Melentyeva

Children 2, including Darya

Era Contemporary philosophy

Region Russian philosophy

School

Neo-Eurasianism

(Eurasia Movement)

National Bolshevism

Institutions Moscow State University (2008–2014)

Main interests Sociology, geopolitics, philosophy

Notable ideas

Neo-Eurasianism

The Fourth Political Theory

Tellurocracy–thalassocracy distinction[2]

Influences

Influenced

Aleksandr Gelyevich Dugin (Russian: Александр Гельевич Дугин; born 7 January 1962) is a Russian political philosopher,[10][11] analyst, and strategist, known for views widely characterized as fascist.[12][13]

Born into a military intelligence family, Dugin was an anti-communist dissident during the 1980s.[14] Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Dugin co-founded the National Bolshevik Party with Eduard Limonov, a party which espoused National Bolshevism, which he later left.[15] In 1997, he published *Foundations of Geopolitics*, in which he outlined his worldview, calling for Russia to rebuild its influence through alliances and conquest, and to challenge the rival Atlanticist "empire" led by the United States.[16][17][18][19] Dugin continued to further develop his ideology of neo-Eurasianism, founding the Eurasia Party in 2002 and writing further books including *The Fourth Political Theory* (2009).[16][14]

Dugin also served as an advisor to the Chairman of the State Duma Gennadiy Seleznyov (Communist Party)[20] and as an advisor to the Chairman of the State Duma Sergey Naryshkin (United Russia).[21] He was the head of the Department of Sociology of International Relations at Moscow State University from 2009 to 2014, losing the position due to backlash over comments regarding clashes in Ukraine.[22][23] Dugin also briefly served as chief editor of the pro-Kremlin Stalinist Orthodox channel Tsargrad TV when it launched in 2015.[24]

His influence on the Russian government and on president Vladimir Putin is disputed.[16] He has no official ties to the Kremlin,[24] but is often referred to in the media as "Putin's brain", [25] though others say his influence is exaggerated.[19][26][27][28]

Early life and education

Dugin was born in Moscow, into the family of a colonel-general in the Soviet military intelligence and candidate of law, Geliy Alexandrovich Dugin, and his wife Galina, a doctor and candidate of medicine.[29] His father left the family when he was three, but ensured that they had a good standard of living, and helped Dugin out of trouble with the authorities on occasion.[30] He was transferred to the customs service due to his son's behaviour in 1983.[31]

In 1979, Aleksandr entered the Moscow Aviation Institute. He was expelled without a degree either because of low academic achievement, dissident activities or both.[32] Afterwards, he began working as a street cleaner. He used a forged reader's card to access the Lenin Library and continue studying.

However, other sources claim he instead started working in a KGB archive, where he had access to banned literature on Masonry, fascism, and paganism.[33]

In 1980, Dugin joined the "Yuzhinsky circle [ru]", an avant-garde dissident group which dabbled in Satanism, esoteric Nazism and other forms of the occult.[34][35][36] In the group, he was known for his embrace of Nazism which he attributes to a rebellion against his Soviet raising, as opposed to genuine sympathy for Hitler.[37] He adopted an alter ego with the name of "Hans Sievers", a reference to Wolfram Sievers, a Nazi researcher of the paranormal.[38]

Studying by himself, he learned to speak Italian, German, French, English[39] and Spanish.[40] He was influenced by René Guénon and by the Traditionalist School. In the V. I. Lenin State Library he discovered the writings of Julius Evola, whose book *Pagan Imperialism* he translated into Russian.[41][42]

Career and political views

Part of a series on

Conservatism in Russia

Lesser Coat of Arms of Russian Empire.svg

Ideologies

Themes

Intellectuals

AksakovDostoevskyDuginFranklIlyinKaramzinKatkovLeontievPobedonostsevProkhanovRozanovSemyonovShafarevichShcherbatovSolzhenitsynStrakhovTikhomirovTikhonUvarovVikulovZhukovsky

Politicians

Parties

Organisations

Media

Related topics

Conservatism portal

flag Russia portal

vte

Early activism

In the 1980s, Dugin was a dissident[43] and an anti-communist.[44] Dugin worked as a journalist before becoming involved in politics just before the fall of communism. In 1988, he and his friend Geydar Dzhemal joined the ultranationalist and anti-Semitic group Pamyat (Memory),[32] which would later give rise to Russian fascism.[45] For a brief period at the beginning of the 1990s he was close to Gennady Zyuganov, leader of the newly formed Communist Party of the Russian Federation, and probably had a role in formulating its nationalist communist ideology.[46][41] In 1993 he co-founded, together with Eduard Limonov, the National Bolshevik Party, whose nationalistic interpretation of Bolshevism was based on the ideas of Ernst Niekisch. He left the party in 1998 following disputes with Limonov.[32]

Publishing career

Dugin published *Foundations of Geopolitics* in 1997. The book was published in multiple editions, and is used in university courses on geopolitics,[33] reportedly including the Academy of the General Staff of the Russian military.[47] It alarmed political scientists in the US,[48] and is sometimes referenced by them as being "Russia's Manifest Destiny".[49] In 1997, his article, "Fascism – Borderless and Red", described "national capitalism" as pre-empting the development of a "genuine, true, radically revolutionary and consistent, fascist fascism" in Russia. He believes that it was "by no means the racist and chauvinist aspects of National Socialism that determined the nature of its ideology. The excesses of this ideology in Germany are a matter exclusively of the Germans ... while Russian fascism is a combination of natural national conservatism with a passionate desire for true changes." [50] The "Waffen-SS and especially the scientific sector of this organization, Ahnenerbe," was "an intellectual oasis in the framework of the National Socialist regime", according to him.[50]

Dugin soon began publishing his own journal entitled *Elementy*, which initially began by praising Franco-Belgian Jean-François Thiriart, belatedly a supporter of a "Euro-Soviet empire which would stretch from Dublin to Vladivostok and would also need to expand to the south, since it require(s) a port on the Indian Ocean." [51] Consistently glorifying both Tsarist and Stalinist Soviet Russia, *Elementy* also indicated his admiration for Julius Evola. Dugin also collaborated with the weekly journal *Den* (The Day), previously directed by Alexander Prokhanov.[46]

Ideology

Aleksandr Dugin in 2014

Dugin disapproves of liberalism and the West, particularly US hegemony.[22] He asserts: "We are on the side of Stalin and the Soviet Union".[52] He describes himself as being a conservative: "We, conservatives, want a strong, solid state, want order and healthy family, positive values, the reinforcing of the importance of religion and the Church in society". He adds: "We want patriotic radio, TV, patriotic experts, patriotic clubs. We want the media that expresses national interests".[53]

According to political scientist Marlène Laruelle, the thinking of Dugin, main manufacturer of a fascism à-la-russe, could be described as a series of concentric circles, with far-right ideologies underpinned by different political and philosophical traditions (Esoteric Nazism, Traditionalism/Perennialism, the German Conservative Revolution and the European New Right) at its backbone.[54]

Dugin adapts Martin Heidegger's thought of Dasein (Existence) and transforms it into a geo-philosophical concept.[55] According to Dugin, the forces of liberal and capitalist Western civilization represent what the ancient Greeks called ὕβρις (hubris), "the essential form of titanism" (the anti-ideal form), which opposes Heaven ("the ideal form—in terms of space, time, being"). In other words, the West would summarize "the revolt of the Earth against Heaven". To what he calls the West's "atomizing" universalism, Dugin contrasts an apophatic universalism, expressed in the political idea of "empire".[55] Values of democracy, human rights and individualism are considered by him not to be universal but uniquely Western.[56]

In 2019, Dugin engaged in a debate with French intellectual Bernard-Henri Lévy on the theme of what has been called "the crisis of capitalism" and the insurrection of nationalist populisms.[57]

Eurasianism, and views on geopolitics

Dugin has theorized the foundation of a "Euro-Asian empire" capable of fighting the US-led Western world.[58][59][60] In this regard, he was the organizer and the first leader of the ultranationalist National Bolshevik Party from 1993 to 1998 (along with Eduard Limonov) and, subsequently, of the National Bolshevik Front and of the Eurasia Party, which then became a non-governmental association. Dugin's Eurasitic ideology therefore aims at the unification of all Russian-speaking peoples in a single country.[61][62] His views have been characterised as Fascist by some critics.[58][59][63][64]

In the early 1990s, Dugin's work at the National Bolshevik Front included research into the roots of national movements and the activities of supporting esoteric groups in the first half of the 20th century. Partnering with Christian Bouchet,[65][66] a then-member of the French Ordo Templi Orientis, and building on Nationalist and migratory-integrative interest groups in Asia and Europe, they contribute in bringing international politics closer to Russia's Eurasian geopolitical concept.

Dugin spent two years studying the geopolitical, semiotic and esoteric theories of the controversial German thinker Herman Wirth (1885–1981), one of the founders of the German Ahnenerbe. This resulted in the book *Hyperborean Theory* (1993), in which Dugin largely endorsed Wirth's ideas as a possible foundation for his Eurasianism.[67] Apparently, this is "one of the most extensive summaries and treatments of Wirth in any language".[68] According to the Moldovan anthropologist Leonid Mosionjnik, Wirth's overtly wild ideas fitted perfectly well in the ideological void after the demise of communism, liberalism and democracy.[69] Dugin also promoted Wirth's claim to have written a book on the history of the Jewish People and the Old Testament, the so-called *Palestinabuch*, which could have changed the world had it not been stolen.[70]

Dugin's ideas, particularly those on "a Turkic–Slavic alliance in the Eurasian sphere", have begun to receive attention among certain nationalistic circles in Turkey, most notably among alleged members of the Ergenekon network, which is the subject of a high-profile trial (on charges of conspiracy).[citation needed] Dugin's Eurasianist ideology has also been linked to his adherence to the doctrines of the Traditionalist School. (Dugin's Traditionalist beliefs are the subject of a book length study by J. Heiser, *The American Empire Should Be Destroyed—Aleksandr Dugin and the Perils of Immanentized Eschatology*. [71]) Dugin also advocates for a Russo-Arab alliance.[72]

In principle, Eurasia and our space, the heartland Russia, remain the staging area of a new anti-bourgeois, anti-American revolution ... The new Eurasian empire will be constructed on the fundamental principle of the common enemy: the rejection of Atlanticism, strategic control of the USA, and the refusal to allow liberal values to dominate us. This common civilizational impulse will be the basis of a political and strategic union.

— The Basics of Geopolitics (1997)

The reborn Russia, according to Dugin's concept, is said by Charles Clover of the Financial Times to be a slightly remade version of the Soviet Union with echoes of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell, where Eurasia was one of three continent-sized super states including Eastasia and Oceania as the other two and was participating in endless war between them.[43] In the Eurasian public discourse sphere, the totalitarian communist policy deployed in over three decades of works by various international groups

that are part of the movement, is "a version of reintegration of the post-Soviet space into a 'Eurasian' sphere of influence for Russia".[73] The North American program "works with a wide range of partners from all sectors of civil society" and "is advanced through grant making, advocacy and research, regional initiatives, and close engagement".[74]

The Kremlin invited Dugin to speak at its Anti-Orange Rally in Moscow in February 2012. There, Dugin addressed tens of thousands with this message:[75]

Dear Russian people! The global American empire strives to bring all countries of the world together under its control. They intervene where they want, asking no one's permission. They come in through the fifth column, which they think will allow them to take over natural resources and rule over countries, people, and continents. They have invaded Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya. Syria and Iran are on the agenda. But their goal is Russia. We are the last obstacle on their way to building a global evil empire. Their agents at Bolotnaya Square and within the government are doing everything to weaken Russia and allow them to bring us under total external control. To resist this most serious threat, we must be united and mobilized! We must remember that we are Russian! That for thousands of years we protected our freedom and independence. We have spilled seas of blood, our own and other people's, to make Russia great. And Russia will be great! Otherwise it will not exist at all. Russia is everything! All else is nothing! [75]

Russian Orthodoxy and Rodnover

Dugin was baptized at the age of six in the Russian Orthodox church of Michurinsk by his great-grandmother Elena Mikhailovna Kargaltseva. Since 1999, he formally embraced a branch of the Old Believers, a Russian religious movement which rejected the 1652–1666 reforms of the official Russian Orthodox Church.[76] Dugin's Eurasian philosophy owes much to Traditional Integralism and Nouvelle Droite movements, and as such it resonates with Neopaganism,[77] a category which in this context means the movement of Slavic Native Faith (Rodnover), especially in the forms of Anastasianism and Ynglism.

Dugin's Eurasianism is often cited as belonging to the same spectrum of these movements,[78] as well as also having influences from Hermetic, Gnostic and Eastern traditions.[79] He calls to rely upon "Eastern theology and mystical currents" for the development of the Fourth Political Theory.[80]

According to Marlene Laruelle, Dugin's adherence to the Old Believers allows him to stand between Paganism and Orthodox Christianity without formally adopting either of them. His choice is not paradoxical, since, according to him—in the wake of René Guénon—Russian Orthodoxy and especially the Old Believers have preserved an esoteric and initiatory character which was utterly lost in Western Christianity. As such, the Russian Orthodox tradition may be merged with Neopaganism and may host "Neopaganism's nationalist force, which anchors it in the Russian soil, and separates it from the two other Christian confessions".[76]

Other views

Dugin wrote a 1997 essay in which he described Soviet-era serial killer Andrei Chikatilo as a mystic and "a practitioner of Dionysian "sacraments" in which the killer/torturer and the victim transcend their "metaphysical dualism" and become one".[81]

Political parties

National Bolshevik Party

In 1992, Eduard Limonov founded the National Bolshevik Front (NBF) as an amalgamation of six minor groups.[82] Aleksandr Dugin was among its earliest members and was instrumental in convincing Limonov to enter politics, and signed the declaration of the founding of the party in 1993.[83] The party first attracted attention in 1992 when two members were arrested for possessing grenades. The incident gave the NBP publicity for a boycott campaign they were organizing against Western goods.[84]

The NBF joined forces with the National Salvation Front (a broad coalition of Russian communists and nationalists).[85] In 1998, Dugin left the NBP as a result of a conflict with other members of the party.[86] This led to the party moving further left in Russia's political spectrum, and led to members of the party denouncing Dugin and his group as fascists.[87]

Eurasia Party

Aleksandr Dugin is seen at the International Conference "New Horizon" in May 2018 in Mashhad, Iran

The Eurasia Party, which advances neo-Eurasianist ideas, was launched in April 2001. Dugin was reported as the group's founder. He said the movement would stress cultural diversity in Russian politics, and oppose "American style globalisation, and would also resist a return to communism and nationalism." It was officially recognized by the Ministry of Justice on 31 May 2001.[46] The Eurasia

Party claims support in some military circles and by leaders of the Orthodox Christian faith in Russia. The party hopes to play a key role in attempts to resolve the Chechen problem, setting the stage for Dugin's objective of a Russian strategic alliance with European and Middle Eastern states, primarily Iran.

In 2005, Dugin founded the Eurasian Youth Union of Russia as the youth wing of the International Eurasia Movement.[88]

Stance on Ukraine and role in Russian politics

Dugin supports Russian President Vladimir Putin and his foreign policies but has opposed the Russian government's economic policies. He stated in 2007: "There are no more opponents of Putin's course and, if there are, they are mentally ill and need to be sent off for clinical examination. Putin is everywhere, Putin is everything, Putin is absolute, and Putin is indispensable". It was voted number two in flattery by readers of Kommersant.[89][clarification needed]

In the Kremlin, Dugin represents the "war party", a division within the leadership over Ukraine.[90] Dugin is an author of Putin's initiative for the annexation of Crimea by Russia.[91] He considered the war between Russia and Ukraine to be inevitable and appealed for Putin to intervene in the war in Donbas.[91] Dugin said: "The Russian Renaissance can only stop by Kiev." [92]

During the 2014 pro-Russian conflict in Ukraine, Dugin was in regular contact with pro-Russian separatist insurgents.[93] He described his position as "unconditionally pro-DPR and pro-LPR".[94] A Skype video call posted on YouTube showed Dugin providing instructions to separatists of South and Eastern Ukraine as well as advising Ekaterina Gubareva, whose husband Pavel Gubarev declared himself the Donetsk Region governor and after that was arrested by the Security Service of Ukraine.[88]

On 31 March 2014, Oleg Bahtiyarov, a member of the Eurasia Youth Union of Russia founded by Dugin, was arrested.[88] He had trained a group of about 200 people to seize parliament and another government building, according to the Security Service of Ukraine.[88]

Dugin stated he was disappointed in President Putin, saying that Putin did not aid the pro-Russian insurgents in Ukraine after the Ukrainian Army's early July 2014 offensive.[93] In August 2014, Dugin called for an eradication of Ukrainian identity.[95]

Halya Coynash of the Kharkiv Human Rights Protection Group said that the influence of Dugin's "Eurasian ideology" on events in eastern Ukraine and on Russia's invasion of the Crimea was beyond any doubt.[96] According to Vincent Jauvert, Dugin's radical ideology became the basis for the internal and foreign policy of the Russian authorities.[97] "So Dugin is worth listening to, in order to understand to which fate the Kremlin is leading its country and the whole of Europe." [97]

Ukraine gave Dugin a five-year entry ban, starting in June 2006,[98] and Kyiv declared him a persona non grata in 2007.[99] His Eurasian Youth Union was banned in Ukraine.[98] In 2007, the Security Service of Ukraine identified persons of the Eurasian Youth Union who committed vandalism on Hoverla in 2007: they climbed up the mountain of Hoverla, imitated sawing down the details of the construction in the form of the small coat of arms of Ukraine by tools brought with them and painted the emblem of the Eurasian Youth Union on the memorial symbol of the Constitution of Ukraine.[98] He was deported back to Russia when he arrived at Simferopol International Airport in June 2007.[100]

Before war broke out between Russia and Georgia in 2008, Dugin visited South Ossetia and predicted: "Our troops will occupy the Georgian capital Tbilisi, the entire country, and perhaps even Ukraine and the Crimean Peninsula, which is historically part of Russia, anyway." [101] Afterwards he said Russia should "not stop at liberating South Ossetia but should move further," and "we have to do something similar in Ukraine." [102] In 2008, Dugin stated that Russia should repeat the Georgian scenario in Ukraine, namely attack it. [103] In September 2008, after the Russian-Georgian war, he did not hide his anger towards Putin, who "dared not drop the other shoe" and "restore the Empire." [97]

On 10 October 2014, Dugin said, "Only after restoring the Greater Russia that is the Eurasian Union, we can become a credible global player. Now these processes slowed down very much. The Ukrainian maidan was the response of the West to the advance of the Russian integration." [104] He described the Euromaidan as a coup d'état carried out by the United States: "America wishes to wage the war against Russia not by its own hands but by the hands of the Ukrainians. Promising to wink at up to 10 thousand victims among the peaceful population of Ukraine and actually demanding the victims, the United States led to this war. The United States carried out the coup d'état during the maidan for the purpose of this war. The United States raised neo-Nazis Russophobes to the power for the purpose of this war." [105]

Dugin said Russia is the major driving force for the current events in Ukraine: "Russia insists on its sovereignty, its liberty, responds to challenges thrown down to it, for example, in Ukraine. Russia is attempting to integrate the post-Soviet space." [104] As Israeli political scientist Vyacheslav Likhachov states, "If one seriously takes the fact that such a person as Alexander Dugin is the ideologist of the

imperial dash for the West, then one can establish that Russia is not going to stop as far as the Atlantic Ocean." [106]

In the 2014 article by Dmitry Bykov "Why TV, Alexander Dugin and Galina Pyshnyak crucified a boy", Channel One Russia's use of the aired story by Dugin and Pyshnyak about the allegedly crucified boy as a pretext for escalating the conflict was compared to the case of Beilis. [107] On 9 July 2014, Dugin on his Facebook account wrote a story that a 6-year-old child was allegedly nailed down to an advertisement board and shot to death before his father's eyes. [108]

On 16 July 2014, Novaya Gazeta provided a videotape of its correspondent Eugen Feldman walking along the main square in Sloviansk, asking local old women if they had heard of the murder of the child. They said such an event did not take place. [108] The website Change.org hosted a petition of citizens who demanded "a comprehensive investigation with identification for all persons involved in the fabrication of the plot." [108]

On 2 October 2014, Dugin described the situation in Donbas: "The humanitarian crisis has long since been raging on the territory of Novorossiia. Already up to a million, if not more, refugees are in the Russian Federation. A large part of the inhabitants of the DPR and the LPR simply moved abroad." [109] In the end of October 2014, Dugin advised the separatists to establish dictatorship in Novorossiia until they win in the confrontation. [110]

Influence on Putin

Dugin's influence on the Russian government and on president Vladimir Putin is disputed. [16] He has no official ties to the Kremlin, [24] but is often referred to in the media as "Putin's brain", [25] and as being responsible for shaping Russian foreign policy. [111] [112] [113] [114] Others contend that Dugin's influence is limited and has been greatly exaggerated, [27] [26] [19] on the basis that the correlations between his views and Russian foreign policy do not imply causation. [28]

In 2016, international relations professor Peter Rutland wrote a review of a book by Charles Clover, the Financial Times's Moscow correspondent. Rutland wrote:

"Clover makes it clear that Dugin does not have any sort of direct influence over Putin. Rather what is happening is that Dugin expressed, early on, the zeitgeist of post-Soviet Russia, identifying the forces of disorientation and resentment that fueled Putin's subsequent actions." [115]

Mark Galeotti, writing in 2022 for The Spectator, argued that Western commentators tend to overstate the importance of Dugin in Russian politics, sometimes even describing him as a new Rasputin. He argued that Dugin's influence on the politics since 2016 was negligible, but that he tried to present himself as an influential person. [116]

In November 2022, the Latvia-based newspaper Meduza reported that, according to sources close to the Kremlin, Dugin's influence on Putin had grown after the killing of his daughter Daria Dugina. According to Meduza's interlocutors, the Western media had often exaggerated Dugin's political influence in the past, but after the murder of Dugina, Putin had allegedly started to take a serious interest in his ideas and to use one of his favourite terms ("Anglo-Saxon") in a public speech. [117]

Dugin openly criticized Putin for failing to defend "Russian cities" such as Kherson, which was liberated from Russian control on 11 November 2022. [118] [119]

Relationships with radical groups in other countries

Dugin made contact with the French far-right thinker Alain de Benoist in 1990. [120] [32] Around the same time he also met the Belgian Jean-François Thiriart and Yves Lacoste. [121] In 1992 he invited some of the European far-right figures he had met into Russia. [122] He also brought members of Jobbik and Golden Dawn to Russia to strengthen their ties to the country. [123]

According to the book War for Eternity by Benjamin R. Teitelbaum, Dugin met Steve Bannon in Rome in 2018 to discuss Russia's geopolitical relationships with the United States and China, as well as Traditionalist esotericism. [124] Dugin also developed links with far-right and far-left political parties in the European Union, including Syriza in Greece, Ataka in Bulgaria, the Freedom Party of Austria, and Front National in France, to influence EU policy on Ukraine and Russia. [95] [125] [126] [127] Dugin is also closely aligned with Israeli journalist Avigdor Eskin, who previously served on the board of Dugin's Eurasia Party. [128]

Fifth column

The typical rhetoric about the fifth column as foreign agents is used by Dugin for political accusations in many publications. In his 2014 interview published by Vzglyad and Komsomolskaya Pravda, he says, "A huge struggle is being conducted. And, of course, Europe has its own fifth column, its own Bolotnaya Square-minded people. And if we have them sitting idly and doing nasty things on Dozhd, Europe is indeed dominated and ruled by the fifth column in full swing. This is the same American riffraff." [129][130]

He sees the United States standing behind all the scenes, including the Russian fifth column. According to his statement, "The danger of our fifth column is not that they are strong, they are absolutely paltry, but that they are hired by the greatest 'godfather' of the modern world—by the United States. That is why they are effective, they work, they are listened to, they get away with anything because they have the world power standing behind them." [129][130] He sees the US embassy as the center for funding and guiding the fifth column and asserts, "We know that the fifth column receives money and instructions from the American embassy." [109]

According to Dugin, the fifth column promoted the breakup of the Soviet Union as a land continental construction, seized power under Boris Yeltsin, and headed Russia as the ruling politico-economic and cultural elite until the 2000s. The fifth column is the regime of liberal reformers of the 1990s and includes former Russian oligarchs Vladimir Gusinsky, Boris Berezovsky, former government officials Mikhail Kasyanov, Boris Nemtsov, Vladimir Ryzhkov, artistic, cultural, and media workers.[131] the Echo of Moscow, the Russian State University for the Humanities, the highest ranks of the National Research University Higher School of Economics, a significant part of teachers of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, and a minority part of teachers of the Moscow State University.[132]

Dugin proposes to deprive the fifth column of Russian citizenship and deport the group from Russia: "I believe it is necessary to deport the fifth column and deprive them of their citizenship." [133] However, in 2007, Dugin argued, "There are no longer opponents of Putin's policy, and if there are, they are mentally ill and should be sent to prophylactic health examination." [134][135] In 2014, Dugin in an interview to Der Spiegel confirmed that he considers the opponents of Putin to be mentally ill.[44]

In one of his publications, Dugin introduced the term the sixth column and defined it as "the fifth column which just pretends to be something different", [131] those who are in favor of Putin, but demand that he stand for liberal values (as opposed to the liberal fifth column, which is specifically against Putin). During the 2014 Russian military intervention in Ukraine, Dugin said that all the Russian sixth column stood up staunchly for Ukrainian oligarch Rinat Akhmetov.[92] As he asserts, "We need to struggle against the fifth and sixth columns." [104]

Russian-American artist Mihail Chemiakin says Dugin is inventing "the sixth column". "Soon, probably, there would already be the seventh one as well. 'The fifth column' is understandable. That is we, intelligentsia, lousy, dirty, who read Camus. And 'the sixth column', in his opinion, is more dangerous, because that is the personal entourage of Vladimir Putin. But he is naïve and understands nothing. And as for Dugin, he can tell him who to shoot to death and who to imprison. Maybe Kudrin, and maybe Medvedev..."[136]

According to Dugin, the whole Internet should be banned: "I think that Internet as such, as a phenomenon is worth prohibiting because it gives nobody anything good." [137] In June 2012, Dugin said in a lecture that chemistry and physics are demonic sciences, and that all Orthodox Russians need to unite around the president of Russia in the last battle between good and evil, following the example of Iran and North Korea.[138] He added: "If we want to liberate ourselves from the West, it is needed to liberate ourselves from textbooks on physics and chemistry." [138]

Dugin has characterized his position on the Ukrainian conflict as "firm opposition to the Junta and Ukrainian Nazism that are annihilating peaceful civilians" as well as rejection of liberalism and US hegemony.[94]

Loss of departmental headship

In 2008 Dugin established a Center for Conservative Studies at the Moscow State University. The Center focused on counter-Enlightenment and conservative ideas of authors such as Guénon, Evola, Schmitt and Heidegger, and on their application to Russian politics.[32] In 2014 Dugin lost that academic position due to the controversy following an interview where he commented on the death of 42 anti-Maidan activists in Odesa saying "But what we see on May 2nd is beyond any limits. Kill them, kill them, kill them. There should not be any more conversations. As a professor, I consider it so". Media outlets interpreted this as a call to kill Ukrainians.[93][139][140] A petition entitled "We demand the dismissal of MSU Faculty of Sociology Professor A. G. Dugin!" was signed by over 10,000 people and sent to the MSU rector Viktor Sadovnichiy.[141][139]

Dugin claimed to have been fired from this post. The university claimed the offer of the position of the department head resulted from a technical error and was therefore cancelled, and that he would remain a professor and deputy department head under contract until September 2014.[93] Dugin wrote the statement of resignation from the faculty staff to be reappointed to the Moscow State University staff due to the offered position of department head, but since the appointment was cancelled he was no

longer a staff member of the faculty nor a staff member of the Moscow State University (the two staff memberships are formally different at the MSU).[22]

Chief editorship of Tsargrad TV

Dugin was named chief editor of Tsargrad TV by businessman Konstantin Malofeev soon after the TV station's founding in 2015.[142]

Personal life

Dugin's first wife was Evgenia Debryanskaya, a Russian activist. They have a son, Artur Dugin, whom they named in honor of Arthur Rimbaud.[81] Dugin had a daughter, Darya Dugina, with his second wife, philosopher Natalya Melentyeva.[143] On 20 August 2022, Dugin's daughter Darya Dugina was killed in a car bombing when the car she was driving exploded near Bolshiye Vyazemy, a suburb of Moscow.[144][145] It is unclear whether she was targeted deliberately, or whether her father, who had been expected to travel with her but switched to another car at the last minute, was the intended target.[145]

Sanctions

On 11 March 2015, the United States Department of the Treasury added Dugin to its list of Russian citizens who are sanctioned as a result of their involvement in the Ukrainian crisis; his Eurasian Youth Union was targeted too.[146] In June 2015, Canada added Dugin to its list of sanctioned individuals.[147]

On 3 March 2022 the United States Department of the Treasury sanctioned the outlet Geopolitika [ru] due to its alleged control by Dugin. Additionally, the United States Department of the Treasury sanctioned Dugin's daughter Darya on the basis of her work as chief editor of the website United World International (UWI). According to the United States Department of the Treasury, UWI was developed as part of Project Lakhta, owned by Yevgeny Prigozhin, who is held responsible for part of the Russian interference in the 2016 United States elections.[148][149]

In January 2023 Japan imposed sanctions on Dugin.[150]

In January 2023 Ukraine imposed sanctions on Dugin for promoting Russia's invasion of Ukraine.[151]

Bibliography

Several of Dugin's books have been published by the publishing house Arktos Media, an English-language publisher for Traditionalist and New Right books.[152][153]

The Great Awakening vs the Great Reset, Arktos (2021)

Political Platonism, Arktos (2019)

Ethnos and Society, Arktos (2018)

Konflikte der Zukunft – Die Rückkehr der Geopolitik, Bonus (2015)

Noomahia: voiny uma. Tri Logosa: Apollon, Dionis, Kibela, Akademicheskii proekt (2014)

Yetnosociologiya, Akademicheskii proekt (2014)

Ethnosociology, Arktos (2019)

Martin Hajdegger: filosofija drugogo Nachala, Akademicheskii proekt (2013)

Martin Heidegger: The Philosophy of Another Beginning, Washington Summit (2014)

V poiskah tiomnogo Logosa, Akademicheskii proekt (2013)

Geopolitika Rossii, Gaudeamus (2012)

Last War of the World-Island: The Geopolitics of Contemporary Russia, Arktos (2015)

Putin protiv Putina, Yauza (2012)

Putin vs Putin, Arktos (2014)

The United States and the New World Order (debate with Olavo de Carvalho), VIDE Editorial (2012)

Chetvertaya Politicheskaya Teoriya, Amfora (2009)

The Fourth Political Theory, Arktos (2012)

Die Vierte Politische Theorie, Arktos (2013)

The Rise of the Fourth Political Theory, Arktos (2017)

EvrAzijskaja missija, Eurasia (2005)

Eurasian Mission: An Introduction to Neo-Eurasianism, Arktos (2014)

Pop-kultura i znaki vremeni, Amphora (2005)

Filosofiya voyny, Yauza (2004)

Absoliutnaia rodina, Arktogetia-tsentri (1999)

Tampliery proletariata: natsional-bol'shevizm i initsiatsiia, Arktogetia (1997)

Osnovy geopolitiki: geopoliticheskoe budushchee Rossii, Arktogetia (1997) (The Foundations of Geopolitics: The Geopolitical Future of Russia)

Metafizika blagoy vesti: Pravoslavnyi ezoterizm, Arktogetia (1996)

Misterii Evrazii, Arktogetia (1996)

Konservativnaia revoliutsiia, Arktogetia (1994)

Konspirologiya (1993)

Aleksandr Dugin on the Alien, Substantially Jewish Elite in the U.S. and Its War Against Traditional American Individualism

June 29, 2022/80 Comments/in Featured Articles, General/by Kevin MacDonald

A translated version of an article by Aleksandr Dugin has appeared on KATEHON, an anti-globalist, pro-Russian website. (When I tried to post a link to the article on Twitter, they said that “the link has been identified by Twitter and its partners as harmful” and they blocked it.) Dugin’s article indicates that he has a solid grasp of politics in the U.S., and for the first time that I am aware of, he points to Jewish influence. Since Dugin is reputedly close to Vladimir Putin (“Putin’s brain” and of course, a “fascist,” as the neoliberal Washington Post phrased it) and because he has supported the Ukrainian war, it indicates that the Russian political establishment understands the upheaval going on in the United States.

Excerpts from Alexander Dugin: “The United States Court Against the Ideology of Progress.”

The fact is that there is not just one American state, but two countries and two nations with this name and this is becoming more and more evident. It is not even a question of Republicans and Democrats, whose conflict is becoming increasingly bitter. It is the fact that there is a deeper division in American society.

Half of the US population is an advocate of pragmatism. This means that for them there is only one yardstick: it works or it doesn’t work, it works/it doesn’t work. That is all. And no dogma either about the subject or the object. Everyone can see himself as whatever he wants, including Elvis Presley or Father Christmas, and if it works, no one dares to object. It is the same with the outside world: there are no inviolable laws, do what you want with the outside world, but if it responds harshly, that is your problem. There are no entities, only interactions. This is the basis of Native American identity, it is the way Americans themselves have traditionally understood liberalism: as freedom to think what you want, to believe what you want, and to behave as you want. Of course, if it comes to conflict, the freedom of one is limited by the freedom of the other, but without trying you cannot know where the fine line is. Try it, maybe it will work.

That is how American society has been up to a certain point. Here, banning abortion, allowing abortion, sex change, punishing sex change, gay parades or neo-Nazi parades were all possible, nothing was turned away at the door, the decision could be anything, and the courts, relying on a multitude of unpredictable criteria, precedents and considerations, were the last resort to decide, in problematic cases, what worked/didn’t work. This is the mysterious side of the Americans, completely

misunderstood by Europeans, and also the key to their success: they have no boundaries, which means they go where they want until someone stops them, and that is exactly what works.

Dugin is describing traditional American political values based on individualism and personal freedom. But traditional American political values have been in conflict with the values of a new, substantially Jewish elite with strong authoritarian tendencies.

But in the American elite, which is made up of people from a wide variety of backgrounds, at some point a critically large number of non-Americans have accumulated. They are predominantly Europeans, often from Russia. Many are ethnically Jewish but imbued with European or Russian-Soviet principles and cultural codes. They brought a different culture and philosophy to the United States. They did not understand or accept American pragmatism at all, seeing it only as a backdrop for their own advancement. That is, they took advantage of American opportunities, but did not intend to adopt a libertarian logic unrelated to any hint of totalitarianism. In reality, it was these alien elites who hijacked the old American democracy. It was they who took the helm of globalist structures and gradually seized power in the United States.

This is exactly what we have emphasized at TOO. There are people with a variety of backgrounds that make up our new elite, but there is a substantial Jewish core with “alien” values, and in general, this elite speaks with one voice and dissent on important issues is not tolerated. This new elite largely emigrated to the United States in late nineteenth and early twentieth century, and the Marxist commitments of many of them were an important aspect of the enactment of the 1924 Immigration Restriction Act in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution. In subsequent decades Jews became the backbone (p. 68ff) of the American Old Left and New Left. Indeed, as noted in my review of Amy Weingarten’s *Jewish Organizations’ Response to Communism* and Senator McCarthy, “a major problem that the organized Jewish community was forced to confront—a problem stemming from the long involvement of the mainstream Jewish community in communism and the far left, at least until the end of World War II, and among a substantial number of Jews even after this period. ... Weingarten points to a “hard core of Jews” (p. 6) who continued to support the Communist Party into the 1950s and continued to have a “decisive role” in shaping the policies of the American Communist Party (CPUSA) (p. 9). These leftist Jews were welcomed into the Jewish organizations during the early post-war, particularly the American Jewish Congress, the largest American Jewish organization, but they were gradually made unwelcome due to the anti-communist fervor of the period.

Notice that Dugin emphasizes that the new alien elite has exploited American individualism to advance these alien values—they “took advantage of American opportunities, but did not intend to adopt a

libertarian logic unrelated to any hint of totalitarianism.” When they achieved power, they rejected the libertarian ethos in favor of top-down, centralized, authoritarian control that is antithetical to traditional American political culture.

This is precisely the thesis of my 2019 book *Individualism and the Western Liberal Tradition: Evolutionary Origins, History, and Prospects for the Future* where I document the rise of the substantially Jewish elite (Ch. 6; see also here) and describe how this new elite is shaping attitudes via domination of the media, the educational system, and political culture. Rejecting the libertarian framework, the new elite favors censoring ideas that conflict with these messages (Ch. 8), and it has established a two-tier justice system in which dissidents from the established orthodoxy are treated far more harshly than those favored by the new elite. In Chapter 9 I argue that traditional Western individualism is under dire threat from this assault. I would add that our new elite is not only alien to traditional Western values, it is also a hostile elite—hostile to the traditional people and culture of America, and that their desired multicultural future in which Whites would be a much-hated minority is very dangerous for Whites.

And I agree entirely that Jews “took advantage of American opportunities.” Because of their intelligence, their ethnic networking, and their long experience as merchants and in financial matters, Jews have certainly shown that they are quite successful in an individualist economic system (capitalism) and they have taken advantage of the relatively low ethnocentrism that is an integral aspect of individualism. As I noted in Chapter 8 of *Individualism*,

as emphasized throughout this book, White people tend to be more individualistic than other peoples, implying that they are less likely than other peoples to make invidious distinctions between ingroups and outgroups and they are more likely to be open to strangers and people who don’t look like them. Because Whites are low in ethnocentrism and high in conscientiousness, controlling ethnocentrism is easier for them. Their subcortical mechanisms responsible for ethnocentrism are weaker to start with and hence easier to control [via messages from the media and educational system enabled by top-down inhibitory control over the modular processing typical of the lower brain].

As a result, this new elite encountered only minimal resistance from the old American elite which was under intense pressure during the 1950s and capitulated entirely in the 1960s and 70s—the era that resulted in *Roe v. Wade* (1973), civil rights legislation, affirmative action, replacement-level non-White immigration, etc.

Critically relevant is that Dugin notes parallels of the new elite with Bolshevik attitudes of authoritarian control, including “destruction” of those seen as having the wrong attitudes: “If you are not a progressive, you are a Nazi and “must be destroyed.”

These elites, often left-liberal, sometimes openly Trotskyist, have brought with them a position that is deeply alien to the American spirit: the belief in linear progress [as in Marxism]. ...

However, the emigrants from the Old World brought with them very different attitudes. For them, progress was a dogma. All history was seen as continuous improvement, as a continuous process of emancipation, improvement, development and accumulation of knowledge [presumably a reference to Marxism]. Progress was a philosophy and a religion. In the name of progress, which included a continuous increase in individual freedoms, technical development and the abolition of traditions and taboos, everything was possible and necessary, and it no longer mattered whether it worked or not. What mattered was progress.

This, however, represented a completely new interpretation of liberalism for the American tradition. The old liberalism argued: no one can ever impose anything on me. The new liberalism responded: a culture of abolition, shaming, total elimination of old habits, sex change, freedom to dispose of the human foetus (pro-choice), equal rights for women and races is not just a possibility, it is a necessity. The old liberalism said: be what you want, as long as it works. The new one replied: you have no right not to be a liberal. If you are not a progressive, you are a Nazi and must be destroyed. Everything must be sacrificed in the name of freedom, LGBT+, transgender and artificial intelligence.

We often hear the phrase “on the right side of history” from progressives, the idea being that history is going in only one direction and change in that direction is inevitable. At this time, being on the right side of history means believing that you believe in a future in which White “racism” is abolished and all peoples will live together in peace and harmony, ethnic conflicts will be abolished, and all groups—freed from the scourge of White racism—will have the same average level of income and achievement. Such a utopian view flies in the face of the long history of ethnic/racial conflict and the reality of biologically based race differences. But believing it is progressive dogma and, as Dugin would say, “If you are not a progressive, you are a Nazi and must be destroyed.”

Dugin is quite aware of the opposition of our hostile elite to Donald Trump:

The conflict between the two societies — the old libertarian, pragmatic one and the new neoliberal, progressive one — has steadily escalated over the past decades and culminated in the Trump presidency. Trump has embodied one America and his globalist democratic opponents the other. The civil war of philosophies has reached a critical point.

As I have written before, Trump made many mistakes and often fumbled the ball on his appointments (although the pool of mainstream Republicans from which he chose was completely corrupt, and he saddled himself with Jared and Ivanka as central players). However, his campaign pronouncements were clearly anti-globalist—opposing immigration (not just illegal), building the wall, wanting better relations with Russia, removing U.S. troops from the Middle East, complaining about the effects of immigration (“Paris isn’t Paris any more”), etc. These pronouncements engendered an unprecedented uproar from our hostile elite (now being reenacted as a result of the recent SCOTUS rulings—blamed on Trump because of his choices in SCOTUS nominations) and the Washington bureaucracy—the deep state (including the FBI). Media articles during the 2016 campaign were replete with messages that Trump was the reincarnation of Hitler, etc. This hostility continued throughout Trump’s presidency resulting in the prolonged Mueller investigation (based on the Russia collusion hoax) and two impeachments by the Democrat-controlled House (with the help of some Republicans). For the entire four years, there was an atmosphere of crisis surrounding Trump’s presidency, and this has continued now with the January 6 Committee hearings (which are mainly aimed at preventing Trump from running again).

Dugin repeats his emphasis on the totalitarian and violent tendencies of the new elite:

New America ... insists that freedom requires violence against those who do not understand it well enough. Which means that freedom must have a normative interpretation and it is up to the neo-liberals themselves to determine how and to whom they use it and how they interpret it. The old liberalism is libertarian. The new is blatantly totalitarian. The Supreme Court is now overturning the totalitarian dictatorial strategy of the neo-liberal globalist elites, who act — a bit like the Bolsheviks in Russia — in the name of the future.

Yes, but I’d say it’s more than “a bit like the Bolsheviks.” Moreover, it’s tempting to think that Dugin is here linking Bolshevik-type authoritarian attitudes to the Jewish overrepresentation in the new American elite, given that he noted the obvious role of Jews in the new globalist elite dominating America, and his likely awareness of the well known outsized Jewish role in the murderous, intensely authoritarian early decades of the USSR with its utopian promises of creating the New Soviet Man. This very large role of Jews in the early decades of the USSR has also been noted by Putin and is presumably common knowledge among Russian intellectuals.

And the almost desperate old Americans, pragmatists and libertarians rejoice [at overturning Roe v. Wade]: the freedom to do what you want, not what the progressives and technocrats say, to go in any direction, not just where the globalists are forcibly sending us, has triumphed again, and Missouri's brave attorney general has already shown what can be done. Bravo! It is a pragmatic revolution, an American-style conservative revolution.

Of course, all the globalist progressive crap is about to go down the drain. The old America has in a way counter-attacked the new America. "If the kingdom of law is divided in itself, it will surely become desolate". Matthew 12:25 Better sooner than later...

"Better sooner than later." I couldn't agree more. While the White population still has political and demographic clout.

Dugin's comments on the alien American elite and his strong support for the Ukrainian war make clear the dominant Russian perspective on this conflict. They see it correctly as a conflict between Russian sovereignty and neoliberal globalist elites based in the West that are aiming for a unipolar world with themselves dominating a subservient, relatively powerless Russia. It is the world dreamed of in the 1990s during the Yeltsin administration and abruptly snuffed out by the rise of Putin. Neoconservatives have targeted Russia ever since.

Make no mistake. It is critical for Russia to win this war. But it's quite clear that the neoconservatives (Blinken, Nuland, Sherman) dominating the Biden administration's foreign policy also see this as a critically important struggle, and they have continued to increase the U.S. commitment—willing to fight to the last Ukrainian. And, I suspect that ultimately they will be willing to use U.S. troops in the conflict to prevent a Russian victory.

FacebookTwitterWhatsAppEmailPrintFriendlyShare

Aleksandr Dugin, Anti-White Globalist: An Introduction to Dugin via his own words. (Part 1)

Date: April 8, 2020

Author: thuletide

21 Comments

Edit (06/03/2022):

I shouldn't have titled this article "an introduction" because it's ten times longer than an introduction should be. If you don't want to read 12,000 words, then please read this much shorter article, which covers the same information and includes a two-minute-long TL;DR explanation. This longer article does contain some extra information that you may find useful but I recommend reading the shorter article.

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Who is Aleksandr Dugin?
3. Dugin's Literary Works
4. Eurasianism and National Bolshevism
5. The Foundations of Geopolitics: What is Neo-Eurasianism ("Duginism")?
6. Dugin's Main Geopolitical Aims ('Foundation of Geopolitics,' TL;DR version)
7. Dugin: Anti-Racist, Anti-Nationalist, and Virulently Anti-White
- Edit / Amendment: "Ethnopluralism"
8. Dugin's Views on Race (TL;DR version)
9. Concluding Part 1: What the hell is going on with the Alt-Right?
10. Addendum/Update: Post-Article Responses

UPDATE! See this article here for a lengthy exposé on Alt-Right Duginism.

“[Duginism] is a case of ideological subversion that is plainly obvious and honest, yet you are called a conspiracy theorist whenever you talk about it.”

– Freedom Alternative, ‘What is Duginism and Why it Matters’

1. Introduction

Lately, there’s been a lot of talk about Dugin and Duginism. “What the fuck is a Dugin and why should I care?” is generally the standard reaction. Unfortunately, most nationalists have no idea who Dugin is and they certainly don’t know what “Duginism” means. I’m partially to blame for this, after I posted a long Twitter thread on the issue that gained some traction. The thread was poorly structured and contained no introductory explanation to Dugin or his history — it was basically just a rant, not particularly helpful. This article should, hopefully, repair that damage by providing nationalists in the West with a solid introduction to Dugin, covering his history, his connections, his beliefs, and his overarching objectives.

Unfortunately, this is going to be a very lengthy multi-part article, there’s so damn much to write about.

The aim of this article is to introduce Westerners to Dugin and Duginism from a Nationalistic perspective, as well as to conclusively demonstrate that Dugin is by no means our ally and that his political theories are completely toxic and subversive. Dugin isn’t even remotely close to being somebody that a European nationalist, White nationalist, or generally pro-White individual should ever be associating with. Yet, that won’t stop swathes of influential figures of the New Right, Alt-Right, and Identitarian movements from singing his praises and regurgitating his shitty ideology.

Duginism is difficult to summarize in brief, as it contains numerous elements that require historic or even esoteric background knowledge to fully understand. An ultra-succinct summary is that Duginism is to the right what “Cultural Marxism” is to the left, though this is an oversimplification and a very surface-level analysis. “Cultural Marxism” is an informal label for the forms of Marxist thought relating to and including Western Marxism, Freudo-Marxism, etc. Basically, “Cultural Marxism” includes all of the forms of Marxism that butthurt Tankies/Stalinists insist are not Real Marxism™ but “Radical Liberalism,” because “muh economics.”

Anyway, both Duginism and Cultural Marxism are forms of Communist entryism that have been neatly refined to appear ostensibly less Communist, or even un-Communist, in order to appeal to non-Communists and subvert more effectively. Duginism, Cultural Marxism, and Communism itself are all part of a much wider political force; a colossal multi-century conspiracy to construct a singular world

government, led by international finance. They have essentially already achieved this objective in a non-official capacity. This article won't be getting into any of that in detail, but it is always important to remember that the System (or the 'New World Order') is not, and has never been, only Marxism or only Liberalism, but a collaboration of both. Liberal elites crush us from above while Marxist intellectuals and grunts undermine us from below, and those who control the money supply sit atop of the pile.

Note: "New World Order" is the globalists' own name for the world government. "Conspiracy theorists" didn't pluck that one out of thin air. If you check YouTube or BitChute, you will undoubtedly find many clips of leading politicians, bankers, oligarchs, etc. using the term. E.g.:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QBSJvtkPICM&t=97s>

2. Who is Aleksandr Dugin?

Aleksandr Gelyevich Dugin, the man behind "Duginism," is a Russian political strategist with ties to some of the most powerful people in Russia; various oligarchs, billionaires, Kremlinites, military men, and even Putin himself. This includes people such as Sergey Naryshkin (Director of the Foreign Intelligence Service), Igor Rodionov (Defence Minister), and Gennadiy Seleznyov (Chairman of the State Duma). Dugin's father was a colonel-general of Russia's Main Intelligence Directorate (GRU), which is essentially the Russian militaries' own KGB; a foreign-intelligence agency. GRU was originally established in the USSR by Leon Trotsky's deputy. Because Dugin's father was an extremely high ranking glowie, Dugin was born into spookdom; the number of influential KGB agents that Dugin has collaborated with is too long to list: <http://archive.vn/iOvCT>.

Wikipedia will tell you that Dugin is a Fascist. He is 100%, unequivocally not a Fascist. Dugin was an early member of the Communist 'National Bolshevik' (NazBol) party and assisted in the party's organization. That should be a huge red flag to any of you with even a basic understanding of the scourge that is Bolshevism and its hellish influence on European people – I'm sure I don't need to elaborate on that. The Russian NazBol party was founded by Eduard Limonov, who (fun fact) most likely worked as a homosexual male prostitute while in the US working as a Communist overseas agent. In 2001, Dugin founded his own 'Eurasia Party.' Four years later he founded the Eurasian Youth Union, which is banned in Ukraine due to the party's destruction of a Ukrainian exhibition documenting the Holodomor (the genocide of Ukrainians by the USSR, 1932 – 1933).

There are a few common misconceptions about Dugin and Duginism in the West, largely propagated by the lying mainstream media, but also by clueless (or subversive?) nationalists spreading disinformation. These include claims that Dugin is...

- A Fascist.
- Nationalistic.
- Anti-imperialist.
- Anti-Liberal.
- Pro-Christian (specifically Orthodox).
- Traditionalist (capital-T Traditionalism of René Guenon and Julius Evola).
- Somehow beneficial to White nationalists within the West.

These claims are not just “slightly untrue” or an “easy mistake to make,” they’re quite literally a polar inversion of the truth. All of the above can generally be debunked in under ten minutes via a quick web search, or by reading Dugin’s own words, so you should be quite skeptical of anyone making any of these claims. At best they are clueless (which is forgivable, due to the vast quantities of disinformation on Dugin) or, at worst, they are malevolent liars.

In addition to being deeply involved with high ranking elites of Russian secret services, military, government, and an assortment of internationalist billionaires, you can also find Dugin cropping up in the most bizarre and unexpected places. See the montage below, featuring some renowned “right-wing” characters. Please bear in mind that I’m not claiming that all of the people listed below are “Duginists,” merely demonstrating that Dugin’s tentacles span far and wide, to debunk the farcical claim that he has limited influence or no influence whatsoever.

Furthermore, I don’t believe that everyone who parrots Dugin’s rhetoric should be accused of being a “Duginist,” as it is entirely possible to unwittingly absorb an ideology via osmosis, which is, in fact, the most common way that people absorb ideology. Consider the modern shitlib leftoids of today: Do any of them understand that their ideas on race and gender were created by a bunch of literal-CIA-and-KGB-

agent Marxists who were funded by David Rockefeller and friends (Frankfurt & New School)? Of course not! They don't understand where their idiotic beliefs originate and most are never informed of the true origin of their delusional worldview. What's the point in subverting somebody if you tell them that you're subverting them?

It may only take a handful of influential individuals to inject a subversive ideology into a movement, political party, or even a nation-state, in order to steer it in the wrong direction. I'm sure you're well aware of COINTELPRO, the influence of "think tanks" such as the Council on Foreign Relations, or even the Rothschild family. A few charismatic men can have a big impact.

3. Dugin's Literary Works

Dugin has written a hell of a lot of things over the years. Though this piece will feature quotes from a variety of his books, articles, and blog posts, the two texts that are key to understanding Dugin's political theories and strategies are 'The Foundations of Geopolitics: The Geopolitical Future of Russia' ('FoG,' 1997) and 'The Fourth Political Theory' ('4PT,' 2009).

Foundations of Geopolitics is by far Dugin's most important work. Dugin himself describes it as an "indispensable guide for all those who make decisions in the most important spheres of Russian political life – for politicians, entrepreneurs, economists, bankers, diplomats, analysts, political scientists, and so on." In FoG, Dugin outlines his 'Neo-Eurasianist' geopolitical strategy, which includes a multitude of instructions on how to subvert, manipulate, and conquer various countries in order to create a Eurasianist empire.

As Dugin said, the book is highly influential among Russian elites, including the military, who used it as a textbook in their Academy of the General Staff. It was co-drafted by Colonel-General Leonid Ivashov, head of the International Department of the Russian Ministry of Defence. After writing FoG, Dugin was hired as a guest lecturer by the military, to explain his geopolitical Neo-Eurasianist theory to Russian officers and the likes. Seleznyov, a former Russian State Duma speaker and a buddy of Dugin, urged that FoG should be incorporated into the Russian school curriculum.

The most important thing about FoG is that it is, essentially, straight-to-the-point and completely “mask-off,” which you’ll see when we get into the contents of the book in the following sections. Fourth Political Theory, on the other hand, couldn’t be more different. You may have seen 4PT being praised by various nationalists in the West, as it has been heavily marketed to Westerners by Arktos Media (which publishes and translates Dugin’s work for Western consumption) and other “New Right” or “Alt-Right” influencers. 4PT is not designed for Russian consumption, but to be read by hapless Western nationalists. Dugin’s aim with 4PT is to ideologically subvert nationalists in the West, making them more malleable and likely to assist (passively or actively) him in achieving the political goals he laid out in Foundations of Geopolitics. 4PT is overflowing with psychobabble, verbose gobbledygook, and complete bastardizations of various historic right-wing thinkers — particularly notable is the manner in which Dugin mutated and completely inverted the Traditionalist School of thought. 4PT will be quoted throughout this piece, but for an idea of the sort of nonsense included in the book, chapter 13, “Gender in the Fourth Political Theory,” is devoted to arguing in favor of a-sexual transgenderism. Behind the shoddy and transparent mask of phony “Traditionalism,” nothing separates Dugin’s Fourth Political Theory from the extant ideology of the New World Order* that he claims to oppose.

* Often labeled as “Neo-Liberalism,” though I personally believe that this label is inaccurate and insufficient.

In summary:

FoG is Dugin’s political strategy document, in which he outlines highly detailed plans on how to create a Eurasian empire by subverting foreign nations, it was written for Eurasianists, to benefit Eurasianists. 4PT is an implementation of FoG’s political strategy, in that 4PT is a subversive book written for Westerners and disseminated in the West, to channel Western nationalism towards Eurasianist ends.

In brief:

FoG = Mask Off = Duginism-For-Me (For Eurasianists) = Influential among elites of Russia.

4PT = Mask On = Duginism-For-Thee (For the enemies/subjects of Eurasianists) = Promoted in the West by the Alt-Right, New Right, and Identitarians (specifically European Identitarians).

4. Eurasianism and National Bolshevism

The basic idea of Eurasianism, which is an ideology/movement dating back to the early 1900s, is that Russia belongs to neither Europe nor Asia and, therefore, must expand to conquer both. The basic aim of Eurasianism is the creation of a single Eurasian superstate/empire; an expanded USSR. To use a trite pop-culture reference, yes, just like '1984.' Eurasianism wasn't necessarily synonymous with Bolshevism but there was a lot of crossover between the two. Not all Eurasianists were Bolsheviks but all Bolsheviks were Eurasianists, this includes Bolsheviks in Europe as well as those in Russia. Eurasianism has been endorsed by a whole range of disreputable characters throughout history, and by that I mean our mortal enemies. Eurasianism has also been endorsed by a handful of characters generally regarded as reputable, such as Francis Parker Yockey. Eurasianism should be recognized as a form of Russian imperialism and malevolent globalism; it's certainly, nothing that a nationalist should want to be involved in, though you don't necessarily have to be a "nationalist" to oppose ultra-globalist hegemonies.

One renowned Eurasianist that you may be familiar with is Richard von Coudenhove-Kalergi, the Freemason who founded the European Union on behalf of the Rothschilds and Warbugs (of the Federal Reserve). Kalergi is infamous for the below quotes from his book 'Adel' (1922), which were republished in his later work 'Praktischer Idealismus' (1925). <http://archive.vn/6piTP>

The idea of a 'United States of Europe' has long been endorsed by globalists from Churchill to Trotsky, to present-day EU officials. A European superstate is a necessary step on the path to a continent-wide Eurasian superstate.

Eurasianism was embraced by the German National Bolsheviks, such as Fritz Wolffheim, Heinrich Laufenberg, Ernst Niekisch, and Karl Paetel (who ret*ards will try to tell you were actually "based nationalists!").

You may ask yourself: “How is it possible to merge Bolshevism – an explicitly globalist, anti-racist, anti-nationalist, Communist ideology – with nationalism?” It isn’t. All historic attempts to merge nationalism with Bolshevism have ended in failure. The result of NazBol is always Nationalism sans-Bolshevism or Bolshevism sans-Nationalism, mostly the latter and never both in unison. Lenin ridiculed German NazBol’s views (on nationalism and race) as “absurd,” and all of the leading NazBol figures were expelled and banned from Germany’s Communist parties. (So much for the “Red/Brown alliance”). The deepest foundations of Bolshevism are anti-nationalist, and a house built upon rotten foundations is destined to collapse.

Many German NazBols opposed German expansionism but simultaneously favored USSR expansionism or pushed for Germany to join the USSR. With regards to Eurasianism, Niekisch wrote “in 1919 Laufenberg already thought in terms of continents.” Paetel’s ‘National Bolshevik Manifesto’ states that: “Revolutionary nationalism must take sides. In other words, to unambiguously be a fighting-comrade, to be with the anti-Versailles forces, to be with the formations that want to fight for the Socialist Fatherland of tomorrow, one must therefore belong at the side of the KPD.” The KPD was the German Communist Party, which also founded ANTIFA.

The NazBols’ economic policy was identical to that of the other Communist parties (dictatorship of the proletariat, banning private property, and so on), and after the Second World War, Niekisch became a regular Orthodox Marxist, as well as a sociology lecturer.

The National Socialists and National Bolsheviks were not the best of friends. Basically, NazBols called NatSocs Capitalist shills and NatSocs called NazBols Judeo-Marxists (Judeo-Bolshevism or Judeo-Masonic Bolshevism being one of the primary NatSoc theories). Eventually, National Bolshevism was outlawed.

With regards to German “National” Bolshevism, Dugin wrote the following in ‘Fourth Political Theory:’

“In 1932, the German National Bolshevik, Ernst Niekisch, whose ideas were remarkably similar to both the Russian National Bolsheviks (Ustrialov) and the Eurasianists, wrote a book with a revealing title: Hitler: Disaster for Germany. Niekisch fought against Nazism and the Nazis, and predicted earlier and

more precisely than most others what would be the consequences of their bloody rule for Germany and mankind. He did not give up. He threw down a challenge to 'evil fate', not putting down his fists. Most importantly: he resisted a strength that seemed invincible with a handful of like-minded anti-Nazis. A group of Niekisch's followers — one of them the National Bolshevik Harro Schulze-Boysen — became the core of the 'Red Orchestra'. It was him, almost blind by then, that the Soviet troops freed from a concentration camp in 1945. He did not see the physical victories for which he gave his life, but until the end of his days he remained convinced that it is necessary to stand opposed to the evil fate of human history, even if it arises from its deepest flywheels."

47 pages later, he wrote:

"The only thing that we insist on in creating such a pact of cooperation is to put aside anti-Communist, as well as anti-fascist, prejudices. These prejudices are the instruments in the hands of liberals and globalists with which they keep their enemies divided. So we should strongly reject anti-Communism as well as anti-fascism. Both of them are counter-revolutionary tools in the hands of the global liberal elite."

I guess he doesn't count writing about "disastrous consequences of the evil and bloody rule of the Nazis" as espousing "anti-fascism." Dugin's political stances are completely schizophrenic, as you'll see in the following Sections.

Note: A lot of people on the internet claiming to be NazBols aren't actually NazBols but shitposters who claim that Stalin and Hitler were based because "le funny genocide men." They probably have absolutely no idea what National Bolshevism (or regular Bolshevism) actually entails, ideologically. The simple fact of the matter is that most people don't really care about reading political theory. And who can blame them? It's usually very boring.

5. The Foundations of Geopolitics: What is Neo-Eurasianism ("Duginism")?

Though 'Duginism' (aka Neo-Eurasianism) is now a "refined" form of subversion (it's still quite obvious if you know what to look for), fortunately, it didn't start that way. FoG paints a crystal clear picture of Dugin's geopolitical agenda and the nature of Neo-Eurasianism in general.

The defining aspect of Dugin's Neo-Eurasianism is that it is, at its core, an oppositional ideology, built upon hatred of the "unipolarity" of the "Atlanticist" West, specifically the United States.

- Dugin, Foundations of Geopolitics, 1997 <http://archive.vn/mh0oi>

"The new Eurasian empire will be constructed on the fundamental principle of the common enemy: the rejection of Atlanticism, strategic control of the USA"

- Dugin, Foundations of Eurasianism, 2015 <http://archive.vn/PD0mc>

"An important aspect of the Eurasian worldview is an absolute denial of Western civilization. In the opinion of the Eurasians, the West with its ideology of liberalism is an absolute evil."

- Dugin, Lecture on Eurasianism at Johns Hopkins University <http://archive.vn/3p4WZ>

"Eurasia and our space, the heartland (Russia), remain the staging area of a new anti-bourgeois, anti-American revolution"

Duginism is opposed to "American" geopolitical and cultural dominance (or "Atlanticist Hegemony"). The existence of "Atlanticist Hegemony" may seem ostensibly true to those of you with a poorer grasp on the nature of globalism. While the US is certainly dominant, it simply serves the larger "New World Order" by acting as its chief golem. The USA is the NWO's international military, so to speak. Once the US is bled dry, the NWO gang will simply pack up shop and move their HQ to Russia and China, which will replace the US as the NWO's global military enforcer. This is something that we already see happening today (and one of the purposes that Duginism serves). See below.

Note: I include the vast quantity of montages below in the hope of dispelling the utterly ludicrous notion that Russia and China are somehow "based and Anti-Z*G." Anyone arguing that is the case is either a clueless noob (forgivable), a complete fucking idiot (less forgivable), or intentionally deceiving you (unforgivable).

The argument frequently made by retarded Alt-Right ecclebs, that Russia and China are somehow opposed to the New World Order, is completely insane and delusional. It is so obviously and easily falsifiable that I find it completely implausible that somebody would ever make this argument in good faith — In other words, that they are not intentionally deceiving you by making said argument.

Anyway, continuing...

In FoG, Dugin describes his Neo-Eurasianism as “the battle for the world rule of Russians,” stating that “the maximum task is the ‘Finlandization’ of all of Europe.”

[Note: as you’ll see in following sections, Dugin is a race denialist, so his idea of the “world rule of ‘Russians’” has absolutely no ethnic or biological basis whatsoever.]

Finlandization is when a powerful entity (usually a country but not necessarily) forces a less powerful country to abide by its laws while allowing the less powerful country to maintain pseudo-independence and its own political system (within the confines of its master’s laws). You could describe the dominance of the New World Order globalists (UN, EU, World Bank, IMF, etc.) over our own countries as a form of Finlandization on a global scale. Finlandization is similar to the creation of vassal states, but unlike a vassal relationship, the small state does not benefit at all.

FoG sets numerous “tasks” to be completed by Russia, Eurasianists, or Dugin’s globalist friends around the world. Remember, this book was written in 1997.

“Tasks in the United States:”

- Russia should use its special forces within the borders of the United States to fuel instability and separatism. For instance, provoke “Afro-American racists.” Russia should “introduce geopolitical disorder into internal American activity, encouraging all kinds of separatism and ethnic, social and racial conflicts, actively supporting all dissident movements – extremist, racist, and sectarian groups, thus destabilizing internal political processes in the U.S. It would also make sense simultaneously to support isolationist tendencies in American politics.”

“Tasks in the Middle East and Central Asia:”

- The book stresses the “continental Russian-Islamic alliance” which lies “at the foundation of anti-Atlanticist strategy”. The alliance is based on the “traditional character of Russian and Islamic civilization”.
- Iran is a key ally. The book uses the term “Moscow-Tehran axis”.
- Armenia has a special role and will serve as a “strategic base” and it is necessary to create “the [subsidiary] axis Moscow-Erevan-Teheran”. Armenians “are an Aryan people ... [like] the Iranians and the Kurds”.
- Azerbaijan could be “split up” or given to Iran.
- Georgia should be dismembered. Abkhazia and “United Ossetia” (which includes Georgia’s South Ossetia) will be incorporated into Russia. Georgia’s independent policies are unacceptable.
- Russia needs to create “geopolitical shocks” within Turkey. These can be achieved by employing Kurds, Armenians and other minorities.
- The book regards the Caucasus as a Russian territory, including “the eastern and northern shores of the Caspian (the territories of Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan)” and Central Asia (mentioning Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghistan and Tajikistan).

“Tasks in Europe:”

- Germany should be offered the de facto political dominance over most Protestant and Catholic states located within Central and Eastern Europe. Kaliningrad oblast could be given back to Germany. The book uses the term a “Moscow-Berlin axis”. [Note that this is the same aim as old German NazBols and modern Russian NazBols]
- France should be encouraged to form a “Franco-German bloc” with Germany. Both countries have a “firm anti-Atlanticist tradition”.
- United Kingdom should be cut off from Europe [Brexit]

- Finland should be absorbed into Russia. Southern Finland will be combined with the Republic of Karelia and northern Finland will be “donated to Murmansk Oblast”.
- Estonia should be given to Germany’s sphere of influence.
- Latvia and Lithuania should be given a “special status” in the Eurasian-Russian sphere.
- Poland should be granted a “special status” in the Eurasian sphere.
- Romania, Macedonia, “Serbian Bosnia” and Greece – “orthodox collectivist East” – will unite with the “Moscow the Third Rome” and reject the “rational-individualistic West”.
- Ukraine should be annexed by Russia because “Ukraine as a state has no geopolitical meaning, no particular cultural import or universal significance, no geographic uniqueness, no ethnic exclusiveness, its certain territorial ambitions represents an enormous danger for all of Eurasia and, without resolving the Ukrainian problem, it is in general senseless to speak about continental politics”. Ukraine should not be allowed to remain independent, unless it is cordon sanitaire, which would be inadmissible.

Foundation of Geopolitics TL;DR:

- Utilizing racial minorities (but also racists) to cause disruption and chaos within “Atlanticist” territories.
- Isolation of the Anglosphere (or the “Atlanticists”) from the rest of their European brethren.
- The merging of various (mostly European) countries to create larger geopolitical blocs.
- The necessity of a Russo-Islamist alliance.
- Absorption of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe into Russia itself.
- The creation of a “Third Rome.”
- The creation of a “Multipolar” world.
- Dugin really hates Ukraine for some reason. [Old Bolsheviks did too].

Below are some extracts from the catechism (doctrine summary) of Dugin’s ‘Eurasian Youth Union’ organization (<http://archive.vn/nVLZQ>):

“You were born to rule Eurasia. Our goal is absolute power. We are the Union of Gentlemen, the new masters of Eurasia. We will affirm our will sovereignly, unwaveringly, irrevocably. Dominance begins with oneself, then passes to the neighbors, then to the distant, and so – in circles – wider and wider, until it reaches the maritime borders of the continent. We are Eurasianists precisely for this reason: our will overturns the borders, it is certainly wider than allotted, allowed, measured, allowed. We are the imperial builders of the newest type, and we don’t agree on less than power over the world... we are the masters of the earth. Until we gain victory, we will be evil. Good should be shown to the vanquished and weak. A strong adversary who is not going to give up and retreat deserves our hatred. Our enemy is the civilization of the far West, on the other side of the ocean. USA. To preserve our “I”, we must introduce strict anti-American hygiene. This is the first step on the path of the great war of the continents: Eurasia against the Atlantic. Our Union has an absolute enemy. This is the USA. This is the beginning and end of our hatred. This is the law of battle: first we bring down the main – great – enemy, then we deal with each other. Eurasianism knows no borders, it crosses the oceans, our cells, squads, squads are growing everywhere.”

You can also check Dugin’s Eurasia Party Wiki for a very brief rundown on his “Eurasian empire.” TL;DR: It will be a multi-racial empire (globalism disguised as nationalism, Civic “Nationalism”), anti-“separatism” and anti-“localism” (anti-racist), founded on “Bolshevik values” (Communist in principle) and feature federalism (Finlandization of smaller states). (<http://archive.vn/QEhXI>). Evidently, Dugin’s claims of “anti-imperialism” are a unidirectional attack on the “Atlanticist” powers, considering that his core objective is the re-establishment of a Eurasian empire.

Dugin’s Neo-Eurasianism, which is Communistic in nature (though Duginists will often deny that fact for “optics” purposes), is heavily inspired by the expansive imperialism of the USSR. Dugin referred to Stalin as a ‘Eurasianist elder brother:’ “Stalin was not a separate individuality, but a collective person, an Elder Brother, a manifestation of Eurasianism in its communist variant.” (<http://archive.vn/IP9Se> pg. 140). In a 2012 interview, Dugin said: “I’ve been struggling with this for 25 years [...] wanting to unite Soviet and Russian patriots [...] We are on the side of Stalin and the Soviet Union” (<http://archive.vn/oCN7s>). Dugin’s journal ‘Elementy’ began by praising Jean-François Thiriart, who advocated a “Euro-Soviet empire which would stretch from Dublin to Vladivostok and [...] need to expand to the south, since it require(s) a port on the Indian Ocean.”

In 2014, Dugin published an article titled ‘Horizons of our Revolution. From Crimea to Lisbon’ via his 4PT website (<http://archive.vn/xAmTi>), in which he stated:

“We aren’t going to limit ourselves by annexing Crimea. That for sure. [...] our revolution will not stop in Western Ukraine. It must go further in Europe. This is the most interesting aspect: With Kiev’s Maidan the U.S. have opened Pandora’s box in Europe. And it cannot be not closed anymore. [...] Europe faces a Revolution in both cases: if we, Russians, win, and if we stop somewhere under NATO pressure. If we win, we will begin the expansion of liberational (from americans) ideology into Europe. It is the goal of full Eurasianism – Europe from Lisbon to Vladivostok. Great Eurasian Continental Empire. And we will build it. This means European Revolution will be Eurasian Revolution. This is our last horizon.”

In this article, he also argues that any resistance to Eurasianist imperialism will be the act of “neo-Nazis” who are funded by the “global financial oligarchy,” which is as hilarious as it is ludicrous, considering that Dugin’s buddies and backers are globalist financial oligarchs. Dugin also argues that European nationalists’ resistance to immigration, Islam, and the LGBT agenda (which he has labeled “neo-Nazism”) can only be stopped via Eurasianist imperialism. More on Dugin’s support of Islam, immigration, and the LGBT agenda later.

The basic summary of the article is: “We’re going to conquer your country in addition to flooding it with immigrants and promoting degeneracy, and if you resist any of that then you are literally Hitler, which justifies our aggression against you.” Where have we heard that one before? How about every single SJW / Libtard / NeoCon / Neolib / Globalist / Communist ever? (<http://archive.vn/xAmTj>)

One day after Putin came to power in 2000, Dugin embraced his glowie heritage and published an article stating that the KGB should be “the backbone of the Eurasian Renaissance.” (<http://archive.vn/iljgv>). Some people have claimed that Dugin’s Eurasia Party was initially bankrolled by the FSB, a successor of the KGB, though I couldn’t verify that for certain. (<http://archive.vn/T9Cus>)

You could be forgiven for assuming that Dugin’s Neo-Eurasianist project is, for all intents and purposes, simply a rebuild of the USSR and a revival of Bolshevism. The Bolsheviks and European Communists have advocated for the creation of a Eurasian superstate since the early 1900s, after all. You could also be forgiven for assuming that Dugin is simply another Communist, indeed this duck not only quacks but swims and flies as well. My stance is that Dugin, like the Communists of the past, is simply an agent of the New World Order, utilizing Communism as a political tool to advance the NWO’s world government agenda. Communism is a piece of a larger puzzle.

Most importantly, this brief introduction to Dugin's true mask-off geopolitical goals should be a decent indicator that he and his agenda are hostile to Europeans and White people internationally. Dugin's pseudo-opposition to "Liberalism" does not make him our ally in the slightest. If you still aren't convinced that Dugin is the enemy of White people, stay tuned for the undeniable evidence listed in Section 7; he spells it out for us very clearly.

6. Dugin's Main Geopolitical Aims ('Foundation of Geopolitics,' TL;DR version)

- Create chaos in the West (especially America) to cause its collapse.
- Promote pro-Russian and pro-Eurasianist attitudes in White countries.
- Increase globalism via the creation of superstates (like the European Union).
- Promote Islam in a positive light.
- Promote relationships and alliances with Muslim countries.
- Cut off "Atlanticist" (Anglosphere) states from other White countries.
- Create a "Multipolar World" – AKA, move the NWO's power base from the West (Atlantic, USA) to the East (Eurasia, Russia).

It seems that the overarching agenda is to engineer a conflict between eastern NWO and western NWO, promoting the Cold-War style false dichotomy that Russia and USA are free entities, distracting from the fact that both are sock puppets of the singular World Government. I assume the overall end game is the engineering of a Third World War, which will result in overt world governance (rather than the covert world governance that we currently live under), as every other major step on the path towards the NWO has followed immediately after a large conflict. See rough timeline below.

Maps that illustrate Dugin's geopolitical strategy.

7. Dugin: Anti-Racist, Anti-Nationalist, and Virulently Anti-White

This has to be made crystal clear: Dugin despises the White race.

Combined with his prominent anti-Racist and anti-Nationalist stances, this is the most vitally important aspect of Duginism, as far as we should be concerned. Though Dugin claims to simply oppose “Atlanticism” and “Liberalism,” he clearly regards the terms ‘White,’ or ‘European,’ “Liberal,” and “Atlanticist” to be interchangeable. It must be noted that Dugin is simply continuing the Bolshevik tradition of anti-racism that was pioneered by Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, etc. (find the relevant quotations [here](#)).

“Marxism puts forward internationalism to replace all forms of nationalism, the fusion of all nations into a highest unity...” – Lenin, 1913

USSR’s anti-racism campaigns:

This section will demonstrate:

1. Dugin’s personal opposition to racism.
2. That Fourth Political Theory (4PT) is 100% anti-racist.
3. Dugin’s belief that all Europeans are racist.
4. Dugin’s endorsement of anti-racist Cultural Marxist and Liberal ultra-globalists.
5. Dugin’s flat-out denial that races and ethnic groups exist on a biological level.

In short, this section will conclusively demonstrate that Dugin's schizophrenic views on race are identical to those of the anti-White System, its purple-haired SJW drones, Cultural Marxists, Neo-Liberals, and every other wretch of the 'modern world' that Dugin claims to oppose.

Dugin's stances on race are longstanding, when he and Limonov revived "National" Bolshevism in Russia in the 1980s/90s, their party had a staunchly anti-racist program, borrowed directly from the old Bolsheviks' stances:

- Dugin, National Bolshevik Must Know, NBP – FAQ <http://archive.vn/rsgp0>

"Any form of xenophobia, anti-Semitism, racial intolerance is alien to the National Bolsheviks. [...] the NBP has nothing to do with neo-Nazis and all kinds of narrow-minded Hitlerists. [...] National Bolsheviks are nationalists of the soil, not nationalists of the blood. This means that for us the ethnic origin of a person does not matter Soil nationalism, imperial nationalism – this is a true manifestation of the Russian idea, in contrast to racist ideas fashionable in certain circles, borrowed from the West and foreign to our national mentality. Unlike ethno-nationalists (neo-Nazis), we do not want to separate the Russians from other peoples who have lived with us for centuries. [...] we consider the Soviet period of our history as a historical stage in which Russia reached the highest point of its power. The October Revolution, the Great Triumph of 1945 – these are the unconditional victories of Russian civilization. Our Bolshevism, the hammer and sickle on the flag means that the National Bolsheviks see themselves as the continuers of these achievements."

He also wrote the following about National Bolshevism (NazBol is basically just another name that Dugin uses for Neo-Eurasianism, as he views NazBol and Neo-Eurasianism as a continuation of Old Bolshevism and the USSR):

- Dugin, EITHER US – OR NOTHING, 1998 <http://arctogaia.com/public/eng-ed8.htm>

National-Bolshevism does not mean the pragmatic ways of Bolsheviks and European Nationalists, conditioned by Realpolitik. Nor does it mean the identical aspects of both "projects". It is something deeper that could appear only after the fall of the historical incarnation of one of the ideologies – the Soviet Union. [...] National-Bolshevism is by far the most interesting phenomenon of the 20th century. The sole alternative for the modern world [...] is NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM. Either it, or nothing. No compromise will change anything."

Fourth Political Theory and Dugin are explicitly anti-racist:

- Dugin, Putin vs Putin: Vladimir Putin Viewed from the Right, 2014 <http://archive.vn/KZJFI>

“Fourth political theory expands the critique of racism to not only biological racism and nationalism, but into all forms of the acceptance of inequality in human societies, whether based on cultural, religious, technological, or economic grounds. The Fourth Political Theory rejects all forms of racism and refuses to consider “race” [...] as the subject of history.”

- As above

“The dividing line between the European 4PT and the third way [Fascism, Nationalism, etc.]: the refusal of any kind of nationalism, chauvinism, Eurocentrism, universalism, racism, or xenophobic attitude.”

- As above

“One must learn to build an international system on the basis of broad and thoughtful social and cultural anthropology and not on the basis of Western-style American-European cultural racism”

- As above

“Thus, modern Gramscianism calls for a counter-hegemonic bloc, a Global Revolutionary Alliance, that brings together all [...] those who oppose the hegemony of Euro-centrism and racism”

Antonio Gramsci: a Communist who invented the ‘Long March through the institutions of power’ form of political entryism favored by the Frankfurt School and utilized by Communists in the West from the 1950s onward. This strategy is an origin of Western (“Cultural”) Marxism. See: <http://archive.vn/iefvN> and <http://archive.vn/WLy9d>.

- Dugin, Vladimir Posner Interviews Alexander Dugin, 2014 <http://archive.vn/YvZcQ>

“I think that racism is a form of the pathological development of the person and I am categorically opposed to racism in all its forms, but there are many kinds of racism besides biological racism [...] Racism as such is in my opinion one of the most revolting pathologies.”

- Dugin, The Magic Disillusion Of A Nationalist Intellectual, 1995 <http://archive.vn/0rq2f>

“I am completely against the Antisemite racist ideals”

- Dugin, Fourth Political Theory, 2012 <http://archive.vn/W8Oij>

“We should strongly oppose any kind of confrontation between the various religious beliefs — Muslims against Christians, the Jews against Muslims, the Muslims against the Hindus and so on.”

All Europeans are explicitly racist:

- Dugin via Der Spiegel, Every Westerner is a Racist, 2014, <http://archive.vn/aLiEt>

“Every westerner is a racist... Western civilization is a racist, ethnocentric civilization... the civilizations of the West and the East are very different. The eastern one is superior in that it fights against the racism of the western one. [...] The ethnocentrism of Western Europe is a constant. You don't have to be surprised about the concentration camps. [...] All European philosophers are racists.”

>Every European is racist and thus personally responsible for the Holocaust.

- Dugin, Fundamental Racism Of The West, 2013 <http://archive.vn/WjXfi>

“It is necessary to discard this racist model of the division of different societies (both biological racism and cultural), to affirm that civilizations are different, and that the criterion of Western civilization is not universal. [...] we first need to develop a theory of a multipolar world, a theory of the equality of civilizations, and in the most brutal way to overthrow the West-centric racism”

- Dugin, Horizons of our Revolution. From Crimea to Lisbon, 2014 <http://archive.vn/xAmTi>

“If in Ukraine energy in the Maidan was Russophobia of Ukrainian neo-Nazis, without which Maidan would not acquired such a radical form of staging a coup, in Europe the same fuel of hatred will become the hatred of nationalists towards immigrants, to Islam and to LGBT.”

- Dugin via 4PT, Vladimir Posner Interviews Alexander Dugin, 2014 <http://archive.vn/YvZcQ>

“Liberalism, incidentally, liberals, were the first to create, the English, the most thoroughgoing racist theories for the justification of their colonial domination.”

The idea that Liberals, of all people, created racism, is absolutely schizophrenic — but that’s Dugin all over.

- Dugin via 4PT, Vladimir Posner Interviews Alexander Dugin, 2014 <http://archive.vn/YvZcQ>

“human rights is a classic racist theory, because in this theory of human rights, the Western concept of the human is taken as a norm.”

Libtards who believe in giving brown people “human rights?” Classic racists, according to Dugin.

Race does not exist, especially the White race:

- Dugin, The Magic Disillusion Of A Nationalist Intellectual, 1995 <http://archive.vn/0rq2f>

“What comes to the myth of “the solidarity of the white race”, it is a complete utopia that leads not only to the Holocaust of the Jews, but also to a genocide of the Slavs. The remains of the Third Reich are a basis for this miserable, contradictory and [c]ompletely false conception.”

White people understanding that they exist means that Jews get Holocausted, according to Dugin. Do you think he was talking about Holodomor when he was referring to the genocide of Slavs? Probably

not, since he denies that it happened and advocated for the genocide of Ukrainians in 2014: <http://archive.vn/8CfRi>.

- Dugin, The Magic Disillusion Of A Nationalist Intellectual, 1995 <http://archive.vn/0rq2f>

“I am certain that many non-white peoples of Eurasia are a thousandfold closer to us in spirit and culture than Americans. In this question I am 100% affirmative with the visions of L.Gumilev.”

Gumilev regarded Russians not to be the kin of Europeans, but the kin of Turks and Mongols. This isn't even remotely true. When the Rus' were conquered by Turks and Mongols, they collaboratively banded together with other White ethnic groups, such as the Germanics and Nomadic Iranics (Vandals, Goths, Alans, and Scythians), to expel the East Asian invaders from their homelands. Yes, the White race is clearly divided into subgroups, but in times of crisis, such as mass territorial invasion by an alien race, Whites as disparate as Romans and Scythians were capable of banding together.

- Dugin via Der Spiegel, Every Westerner is a Racist, 2014, <http://archive.vn/aLiEt>

“We Russians are not nationalists, we have never been a nation. When we speak of “ours”, it is not meant ethnically. The Chechen also belongs to us or the Uzbek. We have said to the Turkish or Mongolian peoples: You are now part of the Orthodox culture, but we will not persecute you. You will have your mosques, you will be able to pray. When we speak of an orthodox folk spirit, it does not mean that we declare war on other cultures.”

Russia is named after the Rus', White North European peoples who were either Varangians (Norse Vikings) or Slavs. They inhabited what is currently present day Western Russia and Ukraine, around the Indo-European Urheimat (original homeland). 'Belarusians' literally translates to 'White Russians.' The Rus' expelled the Turkic Khazars in the late 900s but were invaded by the Turkic Mongols in the mid 1200s. Dugin is wrong, the Russians, specifically the White Russians (not civic-nationality citizenship Russians) have historically been a nation / tribe / ethnic group. (See: <http://archive.vn/TyZ8z>)

- Dugin, On “White Nationalism” & Other Potential Allies in the Global Revolution, 2013 <http://archive.vn/cQUjo>

“I can't defend the concept of the nation, because the idea of the “nation” is a bourgeois concept concocted as a part of modernity in order to destroy traditional societies (empires) and religions”

The above is complete nonsense, the term “nation” refers to a tribe of people, and can be traced back to the root 6500-to-9500-year-old Proto-Indo-European term ‘*gene-,’ to “give birth.” It was communists themselves who warped this term to conflate it with “state” or “country,” which are the territorial or political constructs of a nation (a people). See Stalin’s ‘On the National Question,’ which stated: “What is a nation? A nation is primarily a community, a definite community of people. This community is not racial, nor is it tribal.” <http://archive.vn/tik1t>

- Dugin, Ethnosociology: The Foundations, 2019 (via the Occidental Observer) <http://archive.vn/bTF5b>

With regards to race, Dugin asserts that “ethnosociology does not ascribe any substantial or semantic indication to physical resemblance,” stating that even someone “altogether uncharacteristic for the main population of Eastern Slavic-Great Russians” should “undoubtedly” be considered “a member of the Russian ethnos” as long as he “considers himself Russian, speaks Russian, thinks in Russian, and is a co-participant in Russian culture.”

- As above

With regards to the scientific validity of race, Dugin states that “the physiological, biological, zoological and anthropometric components of this society are not only not the cornerstone; they are not studied at all, since there are no reliable studies (besides racist nonsense) about their credible connection with social peculiarities.”

- Dugin, Ethnosociology: The Foundations, 2019 (via the Occidental Observer) <http://archive.vn/bTF5b>

Related to Dugin’s denial of race is his condemnation of the idea that some civilizations are more developed than others. Dugin describes such approaches as “racist,” “absolutely unscientific,” and “inadmissible.”

- As above

“Boas achieved a real revolution in American Anthropology, wherein, prior to his arrival, evolutionary and Social Darwinist approaches dominated, and racial theories, which explained sociological particularities by innate, inherited markers and racial belonging, were popular, and an inflexible conviction in the absolute superiority of modern Western (European and American) society, its technology and values over the rest of the world, reigned. Boas built his scientific program on the denial of all three forms of racism: evolutionary, biological, and Eurocentric.”

Franz Boas, a Jewish immigrant to the United States, did this for the purpose of facilitating mass migration into America because Madison Grant (from whom he and his students took the American Anthropologist Association via a Zerg-rush coup) had authored a new immigration law that would prevent Jews from entering America. I've already covered Boas to a degree in my article on "Cultural Marxism."

Dugin's praise of anti-White Cultural Marxists, Postmodernists, Neoliberals:

Social Constructionists, Cultural Marxists, Postmodernists, Neoliberals, take a lucky dip in the bag of anti-White globalist intellectuals and you can guarantee that the name you pluck out will be somebody that Dugin has praised. This includes people such as the aforementioned Franz Boas, who pioneered all modern race-denialist ret*rdation, and Claude Levi-Strauss, who co-authored the United Nations' anti-racist 'Statements On Race,' which pioneered all modern anti-racist legislation ("hate speech" and the likes). The entirety of Dugin's "racial" thesis reads like it was written by some ret*rded purple-haired otherkin from Shitbutt University. You can tell when he's in subversion mode because he goes big with the psychobabble.

- Dugin, Fourth Political Theory, 2012 <http://archive.vn/W8Oij>

"the greatest American cultural anthropologist, Franz Boas [...] as well as Claude Levi-Strauss and his school"

Dugin is referencing the Rockefeller Foundation-funded 'New School,' which took in various Communist and Leftist social theorists who fled Fascist-occupied countries during the Second World War: <http://archive.vn/H2LYP>. The New School taught the Cultural Marxist theories of the closely-related 'Frankfurt School.'

- Dugin, Ethnosociology: The Foundations, 2019 (via the Occidental Observer) <http://archive.vn/bTF5b>

Dugin describes Franz Boas as an "outstanding ethnographer, philosopher, and anthropologist."

- Dugin, Political Platonism, 2019 (via the Occidental Observer) <http://archive.vn/bTF5b>

Dugin asserts that “the basic idea of Eurasianism” is “the plurality of civilizations and the baselessness of the Western pretension to universalism,” stating that “the plural anthropology of Boas and Levi-Strauss” is in the same trajectory as Eurasianism.”

- Dugin, Putin vs Putin: Vladimir Putin Viewed from the Right, 2014 <http://archive.vn/KZJFI>

“the major representatives of the structural linguistics in Russia were Levi-Strauss’ teachers and taught him the basics of structural analysis [...] Thus an intellectual continuity can be traced: Eurasianism to structuralism to Neo-Eurasianism”

- Dugin via 4PT, Vladimir Posner Interviews Alexander Dugin, 2014 <http://archive.vn/YvZcQ>

“Franz Boas, Levi-Strauss, they showed wonderfully that human society cannot be measured by a single ruler, and that those who are called primitive tribes are in many senses more sound than contemporary Western society.”

- Dugin, Ethnosociology: The Foundations, 2019 (via the Occidental Observer) <http://archive.vn/bTF5b>

Citing Boas, Dugin asserts “the sole correct form of the classification of ethnos is their placement on the scale “simple — complex,” with the admonition that “the concepts of simplicity and complexity should not carry anything at all positive or negative; these are two neutral constants, founded on the description of a phenomenon. There are simple societies and complex societies. Neither one is better or worse than the other. They are simply different.”

Once again, does this sound any different to the opinions of the modern “Western Liberals” that Dugin supposedly despises?

- Dugin, Ethnosociology: The Foundations, 2019 (via the Occidental Observer) <http://archive.vn/bTF5b>

Dugin has much praise for Boas’ “resplendent constellation of his students, among whom are gathered almost all the stars of American Ethnology, Anthropology, Linguistics and Psychology.”

Race suddenly exists when non-Whites are praised while Whites are abused:

As with all Leftoid scumbags, Communist and Liberal alike, suddenly they recognize the issue of race when it comes to weaponizing non-Whites against Whites, or shaming Whites for the actions of their ancestors. Fourth Political Theorists and NazBols* are no different to the average System goon, SJW, etc., in this regard (and in many other regards).

* Again, actual NazBols, not shitposters who think Hitler and Stalin are both based “because genocide and stuff.”

- Dugin, Fourth Political Theory, 2012 <http://archive.vn/W8Oij>

“Claude Lévi-Strauss demonstrated that savages think in the same way that we do, only their taxonomy is built differently, so they do not have ‘less’ logic than we do; perhaps even more so, and they think in a more refined manner.”

Race is denied until Whites must be derided by implying that “le noble savages” are actually intellectually superior. I don’t know if this is a bad translation, but the way Dugin has used the word “taxonomy” is totally nonsensical. In layman’s terms, he’s arguing that Africans and Europeans are different only because ‘African’ starts with the letter ‘A’ and ‘European’ starts with the letter ‘E.’ Ridiculous.

- Dugin, About the absolute of neo-Eurasism and the phased development of the Eurasian movement, 2001 <https://web.archive.org/web/20170425143037/http://arctogaia.net.ru/article/1277>

“White racism – except for its extremely peripheral and non-indicative branches – is a completely disgusting thing, it’s Atlantist and the root of many great geopolitical catastrophes. The notorious unity of the “white race” is as stupid as the concept of a “united Christian world”. This is the most harmful Atlantist propaganda. Africans = Eurasians.”

Aside from “Africans = Eurasians” being nonsensical even on the most basic level (given that Africa is not part of Eurasia), “Africans = Eurasians” is exactly what the European Union claims. This quote is a particularly good example of the schizophrenic mind of the globalist: somehow White racism is unified and all whites are evil and racist, but the concept of White racial unity is “stupid” and “harmful.” (Note: Africans and Eurasians are very genetically distinct from one another, see: <http://archive.vn/5LFbN>)

The quote below isn't from Dugin, but it is from an open Duginist / Fourth Political Theorist:

- Pisarenko via Dugin's 4PT site, The United States Must Dissolve, If America Is To Survive
<http://archive.vn/T5je5>

“When one makes reference to the “American people” (a common mistake in political speeches), one is referring to something that has never existed. [...] a singular American ethnos has never existed – unless of course one considers the American Indians, who are the only “Americans” that have a justifiable historical claim to the entire North American continent. [...] The colonizers themselves have come from every habitable country on the planet. I cannot in good conscience refer to them as either “immigrants” or “settlers” simply because the land they colonized (and continue to colonize) happens to be stolen property, taken from the American Indians (or Natives) by force of arms. [...] the great majority of the colonizers came from Europe. This majority was collectively responsible for perpetrating three great evils: (1) the mass genocide of the Native population, (2) the enslavement of tens of millions of Africans, and (3) the creation of an ideological Beast called “Americanism.” [...] many are so fanatically racist that they are blind to what must be done – oblivious to the fact that salvation does not lie in hating other races, but rather in destroying the governmental-military complex which controls their very lives [...] all anti-liberals and anti-U.S. nationalists – regardless of race, culture and political orientation – are the natural enemies of the United States as well as the natural allies of the North American anti-Globalist resistance. Be they Black Panthers, Aztlan militants, Southern secessionists or whomever – all those who seek the demise of the United States Government are our comrades in arms.”

- Dugin, On “White Nationalism” & Other Potential Allies in the Global Revolution, 2013
<http://archive.vn/cQUjo>

“Muslims form a part of the Russian population, and are an important minority. Therefore, Islamophobia implicitly calls for the break-up of Russia. The difference between Europe and Russia in our attitude toward Islam is that, for us, Muslims are an organic part of the whole, while for Europe they are a post-colonial wave of re-invaders from a different geopolitical and cultural space. But since we have a common enemy in the globalist elite, which is pro-Pussy Riot/Femen, pro-gay marriage, anti-Putin, anti-Iran, anti-Chávez, anti-social justice and so on, we all need to develop a common strategy with the Muslims. Our traditions are quite different, but the anti-traditional world that is attacking us is united,

and so must we become. Being anti-Communist, anti-Muslim, anti-Eastern, pro-American or Atlanticist today means to belong to the other side.”

- Dugin, On “White Nationalism” & Other Potential Allies in the Global Revolution, 2013

<http://archive.vn/cQUjo>

“When “White nationalists” reaffirm Tradition and the ancient culture of the European peoples, they are right. But when they attack immigrants, Muslims or the nationalists of other countries based on historical conflicts; or when they defend the United States, Atlanticism, liberalism or modernity; or when they consider the White race (the one which produced modernity in its essential features) as being the highest and other races as inferior, I disagree with them completely. I can’t defend Whites when they are in opposition to non-Whites because, being White and Indo-European myself, I recognize the differences of other ethnic groups as being a natural thing, and do not believe in any hierarchy among peoples, because there is not and cannot be any common, universal measure by which to measure and compare the various forms of ethnic societies or their value systems.”

This is an absolutely fucking retarded statement for too many reasons to list. For example, the Indo-Europeans, from the time of the Proto-Indo-Europeans thousands of years ago, have been among the most hierarchical people in recorded history, who viewed some races not only as subhuman but non-human. In this instance, Dugin is simply using language that would appeal to the audience of his writing, i.e. those who he is aiming to subvert: White Nationalists.

Dugin openly supports the ethnic cleansing of Whites, 4PT is pro-White genocide:

Here’s one of the most important quotes, in which Dugin calls for the global genocide of Whites due to the fact that a bunch of foreign occupier subversives control our media and enslave us with pozzed corporations, and states that Russians will be spared due to their lack of “purity” (which is a bizarre thing for a guy who completely denies the biological reality of race to say):

- Dugin via Kommersant, Are you for black or for white? 2002 <http://archive.vn/UyPU>

“I am a supporter of blacks. White civilization; their cultural values, false, dehumanizing model of the world, built by them – did not pay off. Everything goes to the beginning of the anti-white pogroms on a

planetary scale. Russia saved only by the fact that we are not pure white. Predatory multinational corporations, oppression and suppression of all others, MTV, gays and lesbians – this is the fruit of white civilization, from which it is necessary to get rid of. So I am for reds, yellows, greens, blacks – but not for whites.”

- Dugin via E. W. Clowes, Russia on the Edge, 2011 <http://archive.vn/2N5tw>

[He notes that the New World Order will not come about by means of] “aging gentlemen meeting in seminars.” [He advises the following:] “You must take a knife, put on a mask, go out of the house in the evening and kill at least one Yank.”

- Dugin via Fronda.pl, Dugin: I am waiting for Ivan the Terrible (Interview), 1998 <http://archive.vn/gYCFd>

“West is geographical Satan, geographical Antichrist. The West should pay for everything. It would be best to settle it with Chinese, Tatars, Muslims, all this Eurasian nomadism. [...] The West is dead land. He will revive only when he is settled by Cossacks, Tajiks, and Kazakhs. They will bring life with them.”

Here’s a supplementary quote from Kalergi (who is the “the man of the future will be a Eurasian-negroid” guy that founded the European Union with the Rothschilds and Federal Reserve crew):

- Kalergi, Praktischer-Idealismus, Wien/Leipzig: Pan-Europa-Verlag, 1925, p. 23

“The precursor of the planetary man of the future is the Russian Slavic-Tatar-Finnish mongrel of modern Europe; because he, among all the peoples of Europe, is the race of the typical multi-soul people with a wide ranging, encompassing soul”

Many of the above quotes are very similar in nature to the supposed “hoax” quote below:

“We must realize that our party’s most powerful weapon is racial tensions. By propounding into the consciousness of the dark races that for centuries they have been oppressed by whites, we can mold them to the program of the Communist Party. In America we will aim for subtle victory. While inflaming the Negro minority against the whites, we will endeavor to instill in the whites a guilt complex for their exploitation of the Negroes. We will aid the Negroes to rise in prominence in every walk of life, in the professions and in the world of sports and entertainment. With this prestige, the Negro will be able to intermarry with the whites and begin a process which will deliver America to our cause.”

The quote was published in 1912 via The Washington Star and originally attributed to one 'Israel Cohen' of the Communist Party. However, it was subsequently claimed that the quote was a hoax/forgery/fabrication/whatever, and re-attributed to Eustace Mullins, who somehow organized the whole scheme 11 years before he was born in 1923. Miraculous. Regardless of the quotes authenticity, history has played out exactly as the quote describes (at this point, we'll never know if the quote is genuine or not, but we can safely assume that Mr. Mullins isn't a time traveler).

In any case, it's now safe to hammer the final nails into the coffin of the "Dugin is an ally of Whites!" meme that is propagated by the various misguided noobs and subversive swine of nationalism.

And, just to clarify, race is detectable on a genetic level with over 99% accuracy:

Edit / Amendment: "Ethnopluralism"

Unfortunately, I forgot to explain "ethnopluralism" in this article. Ethnopluralism is particularly toxic and subversive. It is sold to nationalists in the West as a form of "each race in their own territory, we love and respect all nations!" when, in reality, it is a form of crypto-multi-racialism that entails forced cultural assimilation of foreign races into the host race's culture, thus "resolving" the problem of multiculturalism. The idea was propagated mostly by Alain de Benoist, who belonged to the National-Bolshevik-dominated French 'Nouvelle Droite' movement and has been repeatedly named by Dugin as a major influence on 'Fourth Political Theory.' Unfortunately, the National Bolshevik origins of the French New Right and European 'Identitarian' movement have, conveniently, been scrubbed from Wikipedia. Under "ethnopluralist" theory, de Benoist has proposed things such as allowing "Sharia ghettos" of non-White immigrants to permanently remain in Europe. These ridiculously subversive 'New Right' ideologues (de Benoist, Guillaume Faye, Dugin, etc.) laid the foundations for the entirety of the modern "right" wing. Jonathan Bowden is probably the only redeeming character of the entire 'New Right.'

8. Dugin's Views on Race (TL;DR version)

- Race has no biological validity at all.
- All cultures are equal.
- Africans are Eurasians.
- Actually, on second thoughts, noble savages are superior to White people.
- [Insert Marxist/Liberal/Postmodernist/Neoliberal] is a true genius.
- Race doesn't exist but all White people are evil and racist.
- White racism caused the Holocaust.
- White racism is responsible for all problems in the world.
- The West should be settled by non-Whites en masse.
- We need planet-wide White genocide.
- Any White people who protest the above are neo-Nazis who justify us carrying out the above anti-White actions.

As previously stated, all of Dugin's retarded racial views are textbook 'Cultural Marxism,' identical to the views of the purple-haired, "SJW libard" drones churned about by our occupied, cancer-ridden education systems.

9. Concluding Part 1: What the hell is going on with the Alt-Right?

Though this article contains a vast amount of information, perhaps too much for the casual reader, I wanted to make sure that it is absolutely undeniable that both Dugin and Duginism are our enemy. This isn't a case of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend" – Dugin and Duginism are the enemy, a wing of the NWO. Nothing Dugin espouses with regards to the things that actually matter — Tradition, Race, Nation, "Gender" (Sex), Metaphysics, White people not being exterminated or bred out of existence — opposes the agenda of the "Neo-Liberal" World Order that he and his fans claim to oppose. It is an identical agenda re-packaged for Russian civic nationalists (globalists) and foolish Western Nationalists. Make no mistake: Duginism is as bad for White Russians as it is for White Westerners.

After reading all of the above, you may now understand why the various New Right / Alt-Right / Identitarian e-celebs who parrot Dugin's rhetoric recoil in horror when they are called out for doing so, denying their Duginist beliefs to the grave. When you call these people out on their weird connections and weird Duginist-esque rhetoric, they will sperg out and strawman you relentlessly, calling you a Neo-Con, Liberal, conspiracy theorist, Russophobe, Sinophobe, Glenn Beck, Hillary Clinton, and more, in addition to accusing you of accusing everyone of being a Duginist, and so on. Their ridiculously hostile and defensive reactions don't exactly scream "innocence."

The Alt-Right publisher "Arktos" first published Dugin's works in English.

(Yeah, there's nothing Evolian about these people, they're just Marxists).

However, as I explained in the introduction, not everyone who espouses Dugin's rhetoric is even aware of the origins of their idiotic and subversive beliefs. In this sense, some people who deny being a Duginist, despite parroting Duginist talking points, may actually be completely honest in their denial. That being said, any leading figure who relentlessly espouses Duginist rhetoric should be viewed with great skepticism. "Thought leaders" should be held to a much higher standard than the average nationalist.

Unfortunately, some people in the nationalist movement are absolutely untrustworthy. Even more unfortunately, many of those people are very influential figures. A prime example is Richard Spencer, who stated that the ideology of the Alt Right is "a kind of Fourth Political Theory" via an article published on Dugin's Geopolitica website. Since then, Spencer has denied being a Duginist, while his rhetoric has only become more brazenly Duginist in nature.

Spencer has been promoting Dugin since 2012:

I know a lot of new people who don't really understand CIA, KGB, and M*ssad trickery don't like to hear this, but yes, a number of your "movement leaders" are completely disingenuous and literally glow-in-the-dark. Take the fat r*t*rd Matt Heimbach, for example. After spending years espousing subversive crypto-Communist rhetoric via the "Traditionalist" Workers Party (the logo of which was a Duginist "Eurasianist star") and destroying nationalism's public image with his grotesque organization and physique, Heimbach relinquished his past hateful ways and joined an anti-racist, anti-extremism organization. He is now a multi-racialist, globalist, Orthodox Marxist, with a shit ton of information on a huge range of nationalists. What a coincidence!

Leading figures of Heimbach's TWP, Eric Striker, for example, are now leading ideologues in the Alt-Right. TWP was openly Eurasianist with clear links to Dugin. Striker relentlessly shills for Putin, Xi Jinping and Eurasia in general, constantly making insane claims that China and Russia (the governments, not the populace) are somehow opposed the NWO.

Matt Parrot, who designed the TWP's logo.

Above & below: Striker shamelessly shilling for “eastern Z*G.”

Note that even other members of the Alt-Right/New Right are asking these people what the fuck they’re doing.

Am I supposed to believe that all of these influential figures are simply ret*rded and clueless? Give me a break. Something fishy is going on with the Alt-Right, and I’m not the only person who has noticed.

There is a trend among the Totally-Not-Duginist crowd to claim that Western/Cultural Marxism is actually “Cultural Liberalism,” thus absolving Marxists (especially the USSR) of their huge role in the creation of the NWO. The USSR, particularly under Lenin, was a pioneer of degenerate Western/Cultural Marxism.

By making this claim, the Totally-Not-Duginists re-frame the NWO as an exclusively “Western” creation, in an attempt to absolve “Eurasia” of blame, strengthening their pitch that Eurasia is the resistance to the “Atlanticist World Order.” Obviously, both the “Eurasian East” (Marxists) and the “Atlanticist West” (Liberals) are to blame.

Keith Woods, who hosts a podcast with Richard Spencer and claimed that the right wing “needs its own Karl Marx.”

This attempted rehabilitation of Marx as a “based racist” is, at best, a heavily distorted version of the truth. For starters, the essay that Woods is referencing is actually a (partially sarcastic) response piece on the topic of Jewish emancipation, secularity of state, economic equality, and material constraints. Marx was not an anti-Semite.

If it quacks like a Marxist.

According to Spencer, Bolsheviks didn’t target Russian (i.e.: White) culture, Holodomor was a lie, the Kalergi Plan is fake, and Kalergi (who was direct friends with the international bankers who founded the Federal Reserve, IMF, and World Bank) founding the EU is irrelevant.

Anyway, as I have said numerous times throughout this article, not everyone who regurgitates this garbage is an intentional Duginist, many won't even be aware that what they are espousing is Duginism. However, regardless of that fact, the Alt-Right is evidently saturated with Duginist thought. It could even be argued that Duginist-esque thought is the very foundation of the Alt-Right (and 'New Right').

Additionally, I strongly advise everyone to ask ecelebs as many awkward questions about Duginism as possible. Ask about their weird connections to organizations with direct links to Dugin. Ask why they support Putin and Xi Jinping when Russia and China are obviously compromised. Ask why they are shilling for Islam and Muslim states after the hundreds of years of Middle Eastern invasions into Europe. Ask why they deny that Western Marxism is real when it evidently dominates the political rhetoric of the globalist left and globalist right.

The only way to highlight this problem is to ask the people responsible for spreading Duginist rhetoric — whether they are doing it intentionally or not — what the fuck they are doing and what the fuck their end game is.

As a quick reminder, the core aspects of Duginism as laid out in Foundations of Geopolitics (and other core documents) are:

Relentlessly promote visceral anti-American anti-Western hatred.

Promote anti-imperialism/colonialism (from the perspective that "West is racist").

Promote pro-Russianism in the West.

Promote pro-Eurasianism in the West.

Promote anti-racism (and anti-White-ism).

Promote "ethnopluralism."

Create chaos to cause the collapse of the West.

Increase globalism via institutions such as the EU.

Promote Islam in a positive light as an ally against globalism.

Promote relationships with Muslim countries.

Cut off the Anglosphere ("Atlanticists") from Europe.

Create a "Multipolar World" (aka create the conditions that can facilitate the NWO shifting its base of power from the USA to Russia and China).

Now, compare these core tenants of Duginism to things that major Alt-Right e-celebs have been promoting for years (some of which is documented above):

Advocating for a Pan-European superstate or "taking over the EU" (lol).

Defending the USSR, specifically Stalin.

Attempted rehabilitation of Marxism.

Claiming that Western Marxism is actually "Cultural Liberalism" (this re-frames the East / "Eurasia" as innocent and the West / "Atlanticists" as the sole creator of the modern world).

Russophilia, claiming that Putin "opposes Z*G."

Sinophilia, claiming that Xi Jinping "opposes Z*G."

Calling everything "Liberalism."

Promoting "ethnopluralism" (which has now moved into "racism bad" territory, as of 2020).

Promoting anti-imperialism/colonialism (from the perspective that "West is racist").

Defending Islam (often via a range of obvious falsities).

Downplaying the historic conflicts between Europeans and the Middle East, especially the attempted Muslim conquest of Europe.

Defending Muslim countries and/or calling them valiant allies against the NWO.

I'm not seeing a whole lot of difference here, except that the Alt-Right claims to be "pro-White," while Dugin is pretty openly anti-White. Take note of influential people who promote the above agendas and regard them with suspicion.

That's all for now. See Addendum below.

Stay tuned for Part 2 (eventually), in which I will cover Dugin's deranged metaphysical beliefs, which includes a mixture of Satanism, Thelema, Aleister Crowley, Chaos Magic, Freemasonry, Kabbalah, Shabbatean-Frankism, and Jewish Messianism. Dugin's emblem, the "Eurasianist" star, is the symbol of Chaos Magic, which was featured a couple of times in Aleister Crowley's Tarot deck. Despite his claims of Orthodoxy, Dugin is as un-Christian and anti-Christian as it gets.

10. Addendum/Update (Post-Article Responses)

This article caused a degree of butthurt and people are now talking about Duginism, which is good. Predictably, the people who regurgitate Dugin's rhetoric almost word-for-word are using the "deny everything and call accusers mentally deranged" defense.

Their other main defense is to claim that they couldn't possibly be Duginists or espouse Duginist rhetoric because they disagree with Dugin's political stance on X, Y or Z, or his personal belief on A, B, or C.

I shouldn't have to explain why this is flaccid and ridiculous, but I will.

Do Marxists agree with all of Marx's personal beliefs? Probably not considering that he called someone a n*gger and said that Africans were too undeveloped to adopt Communism. Do open Marxists even agree with all of Marx's theories? Of course not, just look at the ideological stances of the Marxist-Leninists and Western/Cultural Marxists. Are they fake Marxists? No. I'm sure that the National Socialists, including leading members of the NSDAP, didn't agree with 100% of Hitler's personal beliefs or even 100% of his policies and ideological stances. Were they fake National Socialists? No.

If an individual is parroting most of the core of Duginist ideology;

- Anti-"Atlanticism" (vehement anti-Westernism)
- Anti-Imperialism ("West is racist")
- Anti-Racism

- Pro-Eurasianism (pro-China, pro-Russia)
- Pro-Middle-Easternism (or pro-Islam in general)
- Pan-Europeanism
- Superstatism
- Defending or downplaying Communism
- Defending the USSR (Stalinism, specifically)
- etc.

And if that individual is using Duginist lingo;

- “Multipolarity”
- “Ethnopluralism”
- “Atlanticism”
- etc.

AND if that individual has direct links to Dugin, belongs or belonged to an organization that had direct links to Dugin, or sold and promoted Dugin’s literary works, then what are we supposed to assume?

Should we believe that they aren’t Duginists simply because they claim that they aren’t? That they aren’t Duginists because they don’t agree with some of Dugin’s personal beliefs or his schizoposting?

You wouldn’t be a very good subversive if you wore a name badge and announced the fact that you were subverting people. (This is basically what Dugin did with ‘Foundations of Geopolitics’ before he realized that probably wasn’t the best approach and created ‘Fourth Political Theory’ to disseminate his ideas more subversively).

[Job Title: Duginist Subversive]

Person A: [Parroting 95% of core Marxist ideology]

Person B: "You are a Marxist."

Person A: "I am not a Marxist because I don't agree with Marx calling Lassalle a Jewish-N*gger."

Person A: [Parroting 95% of core Duginist ideology]

Person B: "You are a Duginist"

Person A: "I am not a Duginist because Dugin denies that race is biological and I am 'pro-White.'"

Give me a break. This is gaslighting, pure and simple. Which, ironically, is a typical strategy of the Cultural Marxist left — "Haha what? Nobody is trying to ethnically replace you, Whitey, you're so paranoid :^)"

Once again, I have to clarify that some people (or perhaps many people, as the case may be with the Duginism-saturated Alt-Right) have simply absorbed this ideology via osmosis or proxy. Modern shitlibs have no idea who Adorno is, but they still regurgitate the thesis of 'The Authoritarian Personality' almost verbatim. However, in some cases, the circumstantial evidence is simply undeniable, see Richard Spencer, Matt Heimbach, Arktos Media, etc.

Alexander Dugin – The Battle for the Cosmos in Eurasianist Philosophy

October 25, 2020

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Written in October 2020, previously unpublished.

The Status of the Cosmos in the Eurasianist Worldview

The Eurasianists were never materialists. On this point they found themselves in opposition to the main trends of modern science. At the same time, however, for them it was of importance to not simply affirm the priority of eternal elements and principles – hence the main Eurasianist thesis on ideocracy, the ruling-idea, the rule of ideas – but to insist that the whole world and all of reality, from politics to economics and from religion to science, be permeated with ideas. Petr Savitsky insisted on the concept of “place-development” or “topogenesis” (*mestorazvitie*). “Place-development” is the conjunction of physical space and the continuity of historical meanings, semantics, and events. Territory is inextricably linked with history, and history, in turn, is a continuity of ideas revealing a single image of monumental eternity that unfolds through humanity and over its spiritual path through time.

This defines the Eurasianist understanding of the cosmos. The Eurasianist cosmos is the generalizing territory of the place-development of the spirit. It is the spiritual order that penetrates all levels of reality, both subtle and coarse, soulful and corporeal, social and natural. The Eurasianist cosmos is permeated with subtle trajectories traversed by fiery, eternal ideas and winged meanings. Reading these trajectories, revealing them out of concealment, and extracting complex meanings out of the corporeal plasma of disparate facts and phenomena is the task of humanity. For the Eurasianists, the cosmos is an inner notion. It is revealed not through expansion, but rather, or on the contrary, through immersion deep within it, through concentration on the hidden aspects of the reality given here and now. Cosmic consciousness unfolds not in breadth, but in depth, inside the human subject. It is being within one or another point of the world of the subject that makes this point a “place-development,” “topogenesis.” The very Greek term κόσμος means “order”, “structure”, “organized and ordered whole.” The cosmos is in a state of becoming, development, becoming more and more itself. The world as such, as a simple factuality of surroundings, is not a cosmos. The world only should become a cosmos, and this happens not by and of itself. The world is transformed into a cosmos thanks to the subject, the bearer of mind and spirit. Only then, once thinking presence has been fixed, is this world transformed into a “place-development.” And further, it is only once the two poles, the subjective and the objective, have been established, do they move in an inseverable pair, shaping the special intelligent field of being.

Let us emphasize again: the Eurasianists categorically do not accept materialism. This means that man is not simply a reflection of the external world. He is not created by nature but, on the contrary, it is the spirit and nature, in tight interaction and at times in dialectical opposition, that jointly constitute the cosmos. The cosmos is impossible without nature, but it is also impossible without man. Man is always essentially bipolar, and these poles are fused together through a complex network of interrelations. This dramatic interconnection unfolds as history – not simply as the history of the subject, but as the history of the subject interacting with the object. The cosmos, thus, is a living being. In some sense, it itself is history – not simply its background or attire, and not the object alone, but the synthesis of subject and object.

The Russian Cosmos

All other applied aspects of the Eurasianist worldview become clear from such a philosophical analysis. When the Eurasianists insist that Russia is not simply a state, not simply a country, and that the Russians are not simply one among other peripheral European societies, they base themselves precisely on this

profound understanding of the cosmic dimension of being. Russians are in essence the subject. Yet this subject is placed not in a void (in reality, no void exists), but in a special, existential territory woven first and foremost out of ideas, meanings, and events, and at times also wrapped in landscape and natural environment. The Russian land as the Russian world constitutes the objective pole of the Russian cosmos, insofar as its essence is precisely ideas. The other pole of the Russian cosmos is Russian man. The Russian cosmos encompasses two poles – if we subtract either of them, we immediately destroy their living, luminous, semantic unity, the unity of holy, sacred Rus.

The Russian world is the “place-development” of the Russian cosmos. Therefore, it encompasses both space and time, geography and history. It is impossible to divide Russian people from Russian nature, for together they constitute something whole: a single spiritual-corporeal ensemble.

It is from this position that the Eurasianists considered the main element of their philosophy: Russia-Eurasia is “place-development”, i.e. the direct and fully concrete expression of the “Russian cosmos.” At the same time, the Eurasianists insisted that interpreting this cosmos, studying it, living it, and knowing it, demands none other than the Russian subject. If we study the Russian landscape from the position of a German, Frenchman, Englishman, or more broadly any European, then the very object of study irrevocably changes. Its cosmic constitution disappears. The object is torn away from the subject and we thereby lose its meaning, its significance, its ideational filling.

The very same happens if foreigners attempt to construct a model of Russian history: they see in it only those events which mean something for their own subjectivity, for the criteria and evaluations of the European cosmos. But for the Eurasianists, like the Slavophiles or Nikolai Danilevsky before them, it was obvious that civilizations or cultural-historical types are diverse forms which cannot be reduced to any one normative model. Hence, they insisted that Russia is a “continent”, a special world, a separate civilization. In other words, the Eurasianists’ worldview is built on the recognition of “cosmic pluralism.”

On the Difficult Path to the Universe

At this point a theoretical question might arise. Eurasianism is built on the principle of relativity. But if there exist many cosmoses, then is the matter at hand not a kind of cultural subjectivism? Is striving to affirm one cosmos not that very deep will of humanity towards higher truth?

The following could be said in response to this. Cosmic pluralism by no means excludes a single cosmos. But this cosmos cannot be acquired as a simple sum of "local cosmoses." Moreover, no single civilization can be taken to be something universal, thereby imposing the experience of one's own conceptualization of "place-development" upon others. The cosmos is an extremely subtle notion. We approach it on a path leading inwards within us, into the domain of the mind, the soul, and the spirit. There, at the center of subjectivity – which is always a specific one and is always associated with none other than the objective world surrounding it – is kept the key to grasping the whole. This is not an expansion outwards, not a dialogue with other cosmoses, and not a mechanical addition of other local views, but immersion into the luminous core of the Idea – Russia as the Idea, Europe as the Idea, China as the Idea, etc. – that brings us closer towards common truth. If each were to go deep into their own cosmos, they would near the common – hidden, "apophatic" – true subject and object as such. In other words, the Russian becomes an all-human to the extent that he is more and more Russian, and not vice versa, without losing his Russianness in exchange for something formal and externally borrowed from other peoples and cultures. The same can be said of any representative of any other cosmos. But the presence of this supra-cosmic unity cannot be a known given. It must be experienced in practice. One must traverse the whole path. One could hope that at the end of one's path to themselves in their cosmic roots, a person will reach the common core of humanity, that is the matrix of the cosmos as such, its secret center. But this cannot be claimed in advance. Moreover, it would be a mistake to substitute the concrete experience of one culture with putting it up in advance as something common to all and universal. The Eurasianist approach to the plurality of cosmoses is therefore not one of relativism. It is only a responsible approach, founded on deep respect for the differences of all cultures and societies, on the part of those who strive towards universality but who traverse this path honestly, openly, and consistently, avoiding taking the desired for the real at all costs. The philosopher Martin Heidegger said: "The question whether there exists one God or not should be left to the gods themselves to decide." Only those who have reached the heart of their cosmos can issue a weighty, solid judgement regarding the universal. The will towards the all-human is wonderful, but it cannot be realized without the most important, necessary, and preliminary stage of becoming a perfect Russian, an all-Russian human. Moving in any other direction only distances us from our goal.

Rejecting Nationalism

There is no single cosmos, there are many cosmoses. The Russian cosmos can be known, deciphered, and affirmed only by the Russian subject, of which it is an inalienable part. There is no "nationalism" in this. The Eurasianists recognized "cosmic pluralism" not only in regards to Russians, but also other cultures and civilizations. Moreover, for them the Russian cosmos itself was not a monolith with a strict ethno-cultural dominant. Rather, the specialness of Russia-Eurasia consists in that it encompasses a continental cosmos of numerous particular galaxies, constellations, solar systems, and planetary ensembles. Nikolai Trubetzkoy designated this with the not too successful term "pan-Eurasian nationalism", which in his interpretation meant the multilevel harmony of the ethnic constellations within the common borders of the unified Eurasian cosmic system. Evoking the political concept of "nation", based as such is on individual identity and borrowed from the historical experience of the bourgeois Europe of Modernity ("New Time"), distorts Trubetzkoy's thought, which itself had in mind a harmony of cultural constellations, not a mechanical association of citizens in a political system imposed from above.

Eurasia is a cosmos of cosmoses. Yet it does not claim universality, for beyond the Eurasian cosmos there exists other cosmoses, other civilizations: the European, Chinese, Islamic, Indian, etc. All of them have their own "place-developments", their own models, their own outlines of the conjunction of subject and object, of human thought and the surrounding landscape. The majority of human civilizations, even while being convinced of their own universality, de facto admit the other beyond their borders, that is an other world, an other cosmos, one that is more or less known, at times hostile, at times exotically attractive, at times indifferent. Only the Europe of Modernity, having set upon the path of technological progress, atheism, secularism, and materialistic science, violated this pre-Columbian balance of civilizations which might be called the "era of Empires." It was precisely such Empires that represented the political expressions of that cosmic unity which the Eurasianists taught. The Reformation and the Enlightenment launched war against the very principle of Empire and gradually destroyed these cosmic structures which, more often than not, were united by religious, spiritual, and celestial elements. They destroyed them first in the West itself, then in the East and other parts of the World. Colonization thus became a process of destroying "cosmic pluralism." In New Time, Europeans began to establish among humanity, by force and deceit, a faith in the notion that only the scientific-materialistic cosmos, the one described and studied by modern Western science, is truth in the final instance. All other views structured differently from the rational Western philosophy of New Time and its derivative science were "myths", "delusions", and "prejudices." In the New Time of Modernity, the West set out to "disenchant the world" (à la Max Weber), to divide the subject from the object, and hence to destroy the subtle dialectical links of the cosmos, which were collapsed by such an unnatural splitting. Thus, the West – with its science, its politics, its philosophy, its economics, and its technology –

became a threat to all of mankind. Wherever the West went, whether as a colonial administration or as an object for imitation in science, politics, social life, culture, and art, the cosmos underwent a splitting (into subject and object) and, consequentially, the cosmos was abolished. There could be no more talk of "Holy Rus" or the "Russian world." Empire, religion, tradition, and identity became negative categories, and only natural-scientific conceptions reflecting the history, the "place-development" of Modern Western Europe were considered deserving of trust and the criteria of progress.

The Eurasianists stood against this colonial strategy of the modern West. Not simply the West, but none other than the modern, materialistic, atheistic, secular West, was in their eyes the main challenge and even main enemy. And the worst of all in this enemy was not so much the fact that it rejected the "Russian cosmos" and imposed upon us its own European cosmos – that would be only half the trouble (although in itself no good), but the matter was much harsher: the modern West strove to destroy the cosmos as such, to abolish the very subject-object unity of man and the world, the dialectical harmony of mind and body. And this did not affect Russians alone, being as they have been objects of constant historical pretenses from the West. Modern Western civilization destroyed its own Greco-Roman and later Medieval cosmos as well, and it uprooted the cosmos self-consciousness of all those peoples forcibly or voluntarily ending up under its influence. This idea was consistently presented by Nikolai Trubetzkoy in his programmatic work *Europe and Mankind*, which marked the starting point of the Eurasianist movement as a whole. The modern West is not simply one civilization among others, but an historical anomaly, the result of spiritual – cosmic – catastrophe. This West is a gnoseological and ontological virus. It alone constructed an anti-natural technological civilization, rejected its own origins, and strove to overthrow the very same in all other peoples. Thus, in order to oppose it, it is not enough to defend only one world, one cosmos, even such a large and multidimensional one as the Russian, Eurasian one, but, as Trubetzkoy believed, it is necessary to form a united front of all traditional civilizations which would in unison defend their own cosmoses, different from each and every other and comprehensible only to their own civilizations, their own cultures, their own peoples, their own religions, against the modern West.

Thus, since the very moment of its emergence, Eurasianism was not simply an apologia of the Russian cosmos, but a call for a cosmic alliance of peoples and civilizations against the aggressive plague of anti-cosmic Western Modernity.

Cosmos, but not Cosmism

This notion of the cosmos lies at the very core of Eurasianist philosophy. This becomes especially obvious if we consider the schism that took place among the first Eurasianists in the late 1920s, when the Paris wing of the movement openly took into its arsenal the philosophy of Russian Cosmism of Nikolai Fedorov. This drew renunciation on the part of the founders and main theoreticians of Eurasianism, namely, Trubetzkoy and Savitsky. Although the disputes between the two factions of the Eurasianist movement largely revolved around political motives and especially attitudes towards the USSR, with which the Parisian Eurasianists strove to unite on the Bolsheviks' terms, the philosophical background of the pitiable "Clamart schism" is telling.

Characteristic of "Russian Cosmism" was mixing subject and object, recognizing certain aspects of materialist science, and artificially combining the latter with an idiosyncratic, far from orthodox understanding of Christianity. It is no surprise that many of the Russian Cosmists, such as Andrey Platonov and Marietta Shaginyan, initially sided with the Bolsheviks, seeing nothing anti-natural and unacceptable in materialism, atheism, and progressism. For the profoundly Orthodox intellectuals and philosophers Trubetzkoy, Savitsky, and the first-wave Eurasianists close to them, such an approach was impossible. The Eurasianists' cosmos, being imbued with meanings and permeated with ideas, was thought of as incommensurable with:

the calculations of materialistic science, atomism, and technocracy (in the spirit of Fedorov's dream of administrating natural phenomena);

the dark dreams of resurrecting the dead with scientific technologies;

a free, sometimes purely heretical interpretation of Christian dogma;

an exalted infatuation with nature;

apologetics for Bolshevik fanaticism towards society, religion, and nature.

The cosmos of orthodox Eurasianism has nothing in common with that of Cosmism. The Eurasianist cosmos is completely different, it is structured as a language (it is no coincidence that Trubetzkoy was a globally recognized linguist) and manifest in history (the historical line in Eurasianism was developed by the historian George Vernadsky and the philosopher Lev Karsavin). The Eurasianist cosmos represents

more of an existential horizon with a pronounced subjective vertical and clear mind based on the Platonic hierarchy of ideas and a fully-fledged orthodox Christian worldview. On this point the Eurasianists were the direct heirs of the Russian Slavophiles. Among them we see no hint of any exalted fixation on “naturalism”, much less technological progress, being as such is an expression of the anti-cosmic strike of Western-European Modernity. The Russian cosmos of the Eurasianists sharply, ontologically differs from that of Russian Cosmism, and the “Clamart schism” only emphasized this more clearly.

The Cosmos in Neo-Eurasianism: the Fate of the Great Heart

Now we are left with touching upon the status of the cosmos in neo-Eurasianism.

Neo-Eurasianism has substantially expanded the philosophical apparatus of Eurasianism in many directions. Here we will examine only those directions which directly concern the Eurasianist understanding of the cosmos.

First and foremost, Eurasianism has been brought into convergence with Platonism. Directly appealing to Plato, Platonism, and Neo-Platonism, including Christian Platonism in the Western and Eastern Churches, has qualitatively enriched Eurasianist philosophy, lending an ontological foundation to the theory of Eurasian ideocracy. It is sufficient to decipher the typically Eurasianist thesis of the Idea-Ruler in the context of fully-fledged Platonism – that is, undefiled by Western Modernity – to see how such reveals all of its deep potential. This also concerns the thesis of the “Eurasian selection” necessary for the formation of a Eurasianist elite and the vertical organization of society. All of this is a direct application of the principles of Plato’s Republic, at the head of whose state stand philosophers ruling by the light of Ideas. Politics thus assumes the meaning of constructing an analogue of the heavenly state of eternity on Earth, which refers us to Christian eschatology – the descent of the Heavenly Jerusalem and the foundations of the Byzantine theory of the symphony of powers. Power should be sacred. The state should be a reflection of the eternal archetype. The ruling class should consist of idealists and ascetics devoted to their Fatherland and people precisely by virtue of the fact that they, in turn, are the bearers of a sacred mission.

In Platonism, the cosmos plays an important role as an image of the divine Idea and a living, sacred being. Thus, neo-Eurasianists think of the Russian cosmos as a living image of the Russian Idea, the highest orientation of the Russian subject, Russian politics, and Russian statehood, for profoundly relating to Russian nature and the Russian world as in no way reducible to the pragmatic dimension of natural resources or economic potential. One of the meanings of “cosmos” can be translated as “beauty”, and in this case Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky’s formula “beauty will save the world” can be rephrased as “the Russian cosmos will save the world.”

Yet another feature of neo-Eurasianism is the turn to Traditionalism (à la René Guénon, Julius Evola, Mircea Eliade) as a philosophical substantiation of traditional society and comprehensive critique of European Modernity. Traditionalism introduces the notion of the sacred as the center of the social structure. Sacrality should determine not only religion but politics, the economy, everyday life, and approaches to nature. This also predetermines an interpretation of the cosmos: the cosmos is the domain of sacred elements, powers, and forces. It cannot be interacted with like alienated, soulless material. The cosmos is the territory of the sacred, and it is precisely on this that the approach to Russian land, the state, and nature must be built.

Finally, the geopolitics of neo-Eurasianism conceives of the geography of Russia as of cosmic chosenness. In geopolitics Russia plays none other than the role of Heartland, that is the main pole of the “civilization of Land” and the “axis of world history” (as according to the founder of geopolitics, Halford Mackinder). Thus, the very notion of Eurasia encompasses the idea of a synthesis of East and West, Europe and Asia, that point where the antagonistic forces of sacred geography can and must find balance. In conjunction with sacred geography and Neo-Platonic topology (in the spirit of Proclus’ commentaries on the story of Atlantis from Plato’s *Critias* and *Republic*) geopolitics assigns the “Russian world” and “Russian cosmos” yet another dimension: Russia is not simply one world among others, but is that world which is destined to become the most important space of world history where historical antitheses clash and the fate of humanity reaches its culmination. This is the Russian mission, the fate of the whole “Russian cosmos”, including both its subjects (people, the state, society, culture) and its objects (nature, territory, elements, and the countless ways and forms of life of the abundance of the Russian world).

Share this:

Alexander Dugin : Zionism is Jewish Satanism & The Third Temple Plans Have Begun

Like any religion, Judaism has many dimensions. To speak of him simply, glorifying or overthrowing is primitive.

- Judaism is associated with the notion that Jews are the chosen people (primarily in the religious sense). Their goal is to wait for the Messiah, who will be the King of Israel. Thus, their religion is associated with the expectation of the Messiah

- According to Judaism, at the beginning of the first millennium, the Jews went to the scattering. The Second Temple was destroyed, and a two thousand year history of their scattering began. This era is part of the Jewish tradition. The point is to atone for the sins of Israel accumulated at previous historical stages. If this redemption is valid and deep repentance, then, according to Jewish tradition, the Messiah will appear, which means the blessing of God's chosen people. In this case, the return of the Jews to Israel, the establishment of an independent statehood and the creation of the Third Temple

- This is the structure of the Jewish culture of expectation. The most consistent representatives of this approach are the fundamentalists from the Neturei Karta movement. They say that the Jewish God commanded to endure the difficulties of exile, so we must wait until the end and atone for sins. And when the Messiah comes, then you can return to the Promised Land

- How did it happen that the state has already been created, and the prohibitions are violated? In order to understand why modern Israel is in complete contradiction with the Jewish religion, it is necessary to return to the 17th century, the era of the pseudo-machiah Shabtai Tzvi, the right-of-law of Zionism. He stated that he was a mashaha, and therefore Jews could return to Israel. The fate of Shabtai Zvi is sad: when he arrived at the Ottoman sultan with claims to Palestine, he was given a choice: either to chop off his head, or to convert to Islam. And then a strange thing happens: Shabtai Zvi accepts Islam. Then it became a big disappointment for the Jewish communities.

- However, followers of Shabtai Zvi (Sabbatianism) appeared - the teaching was especially spread among Ashkenazi and Jews of Eastern Europe. At the same time, a Hasidic movement developed, which had no eschatological or messianic orientation, but spread Kabbalistic teaching among ordinary people.

· Theology has emerged in some sects of Sabbatianism (in particular, among Frankists in Poland): allegedly Shabtai Zvi was the real messiah and made the conversion to Islam on purpose thus, he committed “sacred treason” (betrayed Judaism for the coming of the Messiah)

· According to this logic, one can easily move into other religions - Frank, for example, first converted to Islam, then to Catholicism, argued how Jews eat Christian babies ... Completely transgress all forms of Talmudism, betrayed his faith - but the secret doctrine of Frank meant that after the 17th century, the very concept of the Messiah changed. Now the Jews themselves have become the Messiah - no need to wait for it, so even if you betray your religion, you are holy - you are God

· Thus, an intellectual environment for Zionism was created. Zionism is Jewish Satanism, Satanism within Judaism, turning over all the basics. If in Judaism one has to wait for the coming of the Messiah, then in Zionism a Jew is already a god. Further - violations of the Talmudic commandments

· Hence the specific relationship between Zionism and Judaism. On the one hand, Zionism is a continuation of Judaism, on the other, it is its refutation. The Zionists say that there is nothing more to repent of, they have suffered enough and they are God

· This explains the peculiarity of the modern Zionist state, which relies not only on Israel, but also on secular Jews, liberal Jews, Jewish communists, Jewish capitalists, Jewish Christians, Jewish Muslims, Hindu Jews, etc. Everyone who represents the network of Frankism - each of them can quietly carry out sacred treachery, build a state, assert world domination, establish a ban on criticism of Zionism (in some American states, criticism of the state of Israel is equated to anti-Semitism)

· Then they have only one step left - to blow up the Al-Aqsa mosque and proceed to the construction of the Third Temple. By the way, the Knesset has already allocated funds for research on the Temple Mount - everything is moving in this direction

· How can you settle a conflict that has such a deep metaphysical background, by appealing to the UN, with the words “let's make peace” or “let's observe human rights”? In the Palestinian conflict, they saw these human rights in their graves. In addition, we hear from them more and more absurd statements - for example, the accusation of anti-Semitism of those who defend the Semitic Palestinians ...

· If we go beyond hypnosis, fog of nonsense and postmodern defragmentation of consciousness, we will see a very interesting and terrible picture of what is happening in the Middle East.

Alexander Dugin on the fifth and sixth column in Russia:

"The Russian Logos will inevitably encounter the Westernization Logos of the 90s and the sixth column."

"Putin is not necessarily anti-Zionist, he is not anti-Israel. The right line of Russian ideology does not draw consequences from this fact, but the people of the mass draw all possible consequences from it. It is important to note that the majority of liberal Jews are also in favour of Ukraine throughout the world and in Russia. The fifth column is composed almost 100% by Jews. And the sixth column, the indirect opposition, is also composed of Jews, but also by many Russian oligarchs who are allied to the Jewish liberal oligarchs."

Two really good comments:

"Dugin did not even connect feminism when he spoke about him with world Jewry. What can we expect from such a topic as Zionism) Not a single "expert" with weight in the media sphere will tell the truth on this topic. In the Kremlin, Chabad sits, about the "West" generally keep quiet - this is the house of the Jewish mafia. " - CBAPKA

"Zionism is a terrible evil and the source of almost all the problems of modern humanity. Zionists are promoting a destructive lending rate. and constantly confront Islam and Christianity. Islam among the Jews is a bone in the throat because Islam directly prohibits a loan interest. " - жирный пенё

Baron Ungern: God of War

March 9, 2019

Author: Alexander Dugin

Source: Open Revolt

Episode 6 of Alexander Dugin's "Historico-Magical Meditative Radio Show" FINIS MUNDI

Petrograd, 1920. Feliks Edmundovich Dzerzhinsky is finishing up a report for comrade Lenin:

"It seems that Ungern is more dangerous than Semenov. He is stubborn and fanatical. Clever and ruthless. He occupies key positions in Dauria. What are his intentions? To attack Urga in Mongolia or Irkutsk in Siberia? To swing around to Harbin in Manchuria, and then on to Vladivostok? To march on Beijing and restore the Manchurian dynasty to the Chinese throne? His monarchical plans are limitless. But one thing is clear: Ungern is preparing a coup. He is our most dangerous enemy to date. Destroying him is a matter of life and death."

Dzerzhinsky attached to his report to the Supreme Soviet an excerpt from a letter that had fallen into the hands of Siberian partisans:

"The Baron pronounces the words 'commissar' and 'communist' with hatred, often adding 'will be hanged.' He has no favorites, he is unusually firm, adamant in matters of discipline, very cruel, and very gullible...He lives surrounded by Lamas and shamans...Out of addiction to the scandalous and unusual, he calls himself a Buddhist. It is more likely that he belongs to some far-right Baltic sect. His enemies call him the 'Mad Baron.'"

Baron Roman Fedorovich von Ungern-Sternberg was born on December 20th, 1885 in Graz (Austria) to a family of Baltic aristocrats living in Estonia. His family can be traced back to at least the 18th century. According to reliable data, two of his ancestors belonged to the Knights of the Teutonic Order and fell at the hands of the Poles. His family members served the Order, then Germany, and, finally, the Russian Tsar and Russian Empire. According to the baron himself, his grandfather converted to Buddhism while

in India, after which his father and he himself also became Buddhists. The baron graduated gymnasium in Reval (Tallinn) and attended a cadets school in St. Petersburg, where in 1909 he was sent to a Cossack corps in Chita. During an officers quarrel in Chita, the baron challenged his opponent to a duel and wounded him. The baron himself sustained a serious injury, as a result of which he would experience severe headaches throughout the rest of his life, to the point that at times he lost the ability to see.

Because of this duel, the baron was expelled from the corps in July of 1910, from then onwards beginning a journey around Siberia accompanied by only one companion – his hunting dog Misha. Somehow he ended up in Mongolia, which was destined to be his fate. This strange, desert-stretched, wild, ancient and harsh country fascinated Ungern. In Mongolia, the baron managed to get into personal contact with the living Buddha, Kutuktu, the supreme figure of Mongolian Lamaism. At the time, Mongolia was experiencing a revival of imperial sentiments and was seeking independence from China. In Urga, the Mongolian capital, the baron's determined character was soon noticed, and Kutuktu himself appointed Ungern commander of the Mongol cavalry. Taking advantage of the unrest and revolution in China, the Mongols succeeded in expelling the Chinese occupants from their country, and in 1911 the "living Buddha" established an independent monarchy in Mongolia.

The baron's military services for Kutuktu were duly noted, and he became a deeply revered figure in the Mongol world. Before his departure from Mongolia, Baron Ungern, accompanied by his friend Prince Djam Bolon. At the latter's insistence, Ungern visited a clairvoyant of a most ancient and respected shamanic line. In this fateful moment, in a trance, the clairvoyant revealed to Baron Ungern the secret of his spiritual nature:

"I see the God of War...

He rides a gray horse across our steppes and our mountains. You will

Rule over a vast territory, oh white God of War.

I see blood, lots of blood...

A horse...

Lots of blood.

Red blood...

I see no more. The White God of War has disappeared."

In 1912, Ungern visited Europe – Austria, Germany, and France. According to the testimonies offered in Krauthof's book on Ungern, *Ich Befehle* ("I order"), in Paris the baron met and fell in love with the woman of his heart, Danielle. This was just on the eve of the First World War. True to his duty and on the order of the Tsar, the baron was compelled to return to Russia to take his place in the ranks of the imperial army.

Ungern set off back to the Homeland with his sweetheart, Danielle. But in Germany he was threatened with arrest for being an officer of the enemy army. The baron took an extremely risky journey on a small boat across the Baltic Sea. The little vessel was wrecked in a storm, and the lady was killed. The baron's survival was nothing more than a miracle. From that time on, the baron would never be the same. Thenceforth he paid no attention to women. He became extremely ascetic and extremely, inhumanely cruel. In his review of Krauthof's book, Julius Evola wrote: "Great passion incinerated all the human elements inside of him, and from then on only the sacred force that stands above life and death remained in him."

The maelstrom of war pulled him in. The baron fought with inimitable courage against the Austrians, sustaining multiple wounds and being awarded the Cross of St. George and the Sword of Honor for his bravery and selflessness. After the Bolshevik revolution, Ungern was one of the first to engage in merciless battle with the Reds under the command of Ataman Semenov. And in this war, he distinguished himself with unbridled courage, steadfastness, and superb knowledge of military strategy.

Ungern gradually organized his own division consisting of Russian officers, Cossacks, and indigenous Siberians (especially Buryats) who remained faithful to the Emperor. Its full name was the Asian Cavalry Division. Incredible, inhuman discipline reigned in Ungern's units. The slightest offenses were punished in the most merciless manner up to the death penalty.

Major Antoni Aleksandrowicz, a White officer of Polish origins and former Mongolian artillery instructor, wrote:

“Baron Ungern was an outstanding man, extremely complex both psychologically and politically. (1) He saw in Bolshevism the enemy of civilization. (2) He despised Russians for having betrayed their legitimate sovereign and failing to cast off the communist yoke. (3) Nevertheless, among Russians he singled out and liked ordinary peasants and soldiers while he fiercely hated the intelligentsia. (4) He was a Buddhist who was obsessed with the dream of creating a knightly order in the likes of the Teutonic Order and Japanese Bushido. (5) He strove to create a gigantic Asian coalition, with which he wanted to set off on a conquest of Europe to turn it towards the teaching of the Buddha. (6) He was in contact with the Dalai Lama and the Muslims of Asia. He wielded the title of Khan of Mongolia as well as the title of ‘bonze’, or an initiate of Lamaism. (7) He was ruthless to an extent that only an ascetic could be. The absolute absence of sensitivity that was typical of him can be encountered only among beings who know neither pain, joy, pity, nor sorrow. (8) He possessed an extraordinary mind and considerable knowledge. His ability as a medium allowed him to completely accurately understand the nature of whomever he spoke with from the first minute of conversation.”

This account of Baron Ungern, left by a man who served him, was published in 1938 by none other than René Guénon himself in the main Traditionalist organ, the journal *Études Traditionnelles*.

Mongolia once again lost its independence, and its capital, Urga, was occupied by Chinese troops who actively cooperated with Bolshevik agents and provocateurs among the local population. Kutuktu, the living Buddha, was arrested. The absolutely sovereign, spiritually-incarnated, theocratic ruler of Great Free Mongolia was made into a pathetic prisoner.

The White Cause gradually lost on all fronts. After Kolchak’s defeat, only Ataman Semenov and Baron Ungern posed serious, fierce resistance in the East. Pressed on all sides by the Reds, the Asian Cavalry Division entered Mongolia. Its ranks were composed of representatives of many peoples – both European and Asia. Having lost the Russian Empire, the heroes of the Asian Cavalry Division, faithful to the Principle, marched on to restore the Mongol Empire.

Ungern gradually devised a desperate geopolitical plan to create a unique zone in Asia, or more precisely in Mongolia, free from both Bolshevik influence and the troops of the profane West. It would be a unique world in which the ancient laws of the Sacred Tradition would be in force. Ungern was familiar with the books of Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, and knew of the existence of the secret, underground country of Agartha, where the laws of time are not in effect and where the King of the World, the Chakravarti, resides. Like the Knights Templar, who not only guarded European pilgrims from the Saracens, but also protected the great mysteries of spiritual knowledge from degenerate Catholicism and the secularizing French monarchy, Ungern aimed to create a special zone between the shrines of Tibet, where according to legend lies the entrance to Agartha, and the rest of the world.

"The Name of Mongolia – Khalkha – means 'Shield.' It is the ancient homeland of Genghis Khan, the restorer of the Empire of Ram. The mission of Mongolia is to serve as an obstacle in the path of the rabid hordes of apocalyptic humanity – the Gogs and Magogs of Bolshevism, democracy, and the profane world, the freaks of the modern world...Here, and none other than here, Tradition must be restored and a fight be put up against the forces of the West, the citadel of perversion, the source of Evil. The whole destiny of my line is that of going to the East, to the Rising Sun. I have no heirs and I have reached the Eastern edge of Eurasia myself, on my own. There is nowhere further to go. From this magical point of sacred geography shall begin the Great Restoration...Khalkha – the sacred steppes, the Great Shield."

Ungern entered Mongolia not as a leader of the last unit of an army battered by the Reds, but as a "mythological hero", an incarnation of the God of War, as the fulfiller of the Swedish mystic Swedenborg's testament that "only the sages of the Eurasian steppes of Tartary" – Mongolia – "can find the key to the mysteries of the sacred cycles and the original mystical manuscript long ago lost by humanity under the strange title "The War of Jehovah."

Ungern's troops neared Chinese-occupied Urga. On February 3rd, 1920 the baron ordered an attack on the Mongol city of Urga, defended by a Chinese garrison which greatly outnumbered the baron's warriors. Thanks to a rapid and frantic operation in which Ungern himself took part, his men managed to free Kutuktu, the living Buddha, who was guarded by a large and well-armed Chinese unit. Afterwards, the Asian Cavalry Division, together with Mongol units that joined the baron, attacked Urga. It was a brilliant and extremely important Victory. Tradition and Order were restored in Mongolia. Kutuktu appointed the baron the absolute dictator of Mongolia. Baron Ungern became the first European to receive the title Khan of War, Khan-Chan-Chun.

The first part of this mad plan, parallels to which can only be found in the magnificent and brilliant Middle Ages, not in the "skeptical" and "cynical" 20th century, seemed to be coming true. Henceforth,

the dictator of Mongolia, Khan-Chan-Chun, or simply Ungern-Khan, the cruel and noble ascetic, initiated his plan to restore the sacred meaning of Khalkha, the magical Shield of the earth.

No, this is not a fairy tale, not a hallucination. This really happened. Relatively recently.

In dark times, the purity of a hero draws such resistance from the degenerate surrounding environment that curbing and subordinating it necessitates extraordinary means. It is only a matter of course that the majority of officers and soldiers of the Asian Cavalry Division, the Russian Cossacks, and servants did not comprehend the sacred ideals of the mad baron. Kolchak and Wrangel's failures, apathy, and fatigue all demoralized the army. Many could not resist drinking, stealing, looting, and deserting...The corrupting spirit of the decomposing emigration, the Harbin Russian saloons, and vacant spaces among Parisian taxi drivers – all with Russian tears, saliva, and sighs – all irresistibly tempted the broken fragments of Kolchak's army.

The Khan of War had to resort to extreme measures. He organized a system of severe punishments. 18 officers, some of whom were decorated veterans personally loyal to Ungern, were thrown into the icy, stormy Mongolian river for drunkenness. He spared no one and nothing. Some of those who could swim survived. Some didn't. But the drinking stopped among them and the rest of those who saw the frozen-blue, frostbitten corpses of their comrades. Such was a kind of forced conversion of the Cossacks to shamanism – after all, swimming in the river in winter in one's clothes by virtue of internal heat, *tapas*, and then drying one's clothes on the shore with the warmth of one's own body, is a typical shamanic practice. There could not have been more appropriate conditions for indulging in such a national custom.

Colonel Sipailov, Ungern's shadow, nicknamed the "Thug" in the army, behaved even more grimly. Sipailov was a typical "dark twin" [to Ungern]. Such grotesque characters very often accompany the personal path of great men, embodying the dark aspects of the soul of the hero. If Ungern's brutality was founded on high spiritual asceticism and was akin to a kind of holiness, then Colonel Sipailov was a genuinely mad sadist. For abusing a yard dog, Sipailov shot the best Cossack commander in all of Ungern's army and put his corpse on public display. Some were beaten to death with whips for all types of faults, even the tiniest spoils. Sipailov was Ungern's Dzerzhinsky. All the means by which Ungern imposed order in Mongolia and his army strikingly resembled the Bolshevik terror – no wonder the Bolsheviks respected Ungern more than other leaders of the White movement. Behind it all one could glimpse some kind of inner affinity, a unity of common type at that magical point where extreme right meets extreme left, where opposites coincide.

Sipailov's atrocities were wild and senseless. Only for a short time did this "black double" of Ungern soften, when he met a girl who melted the stale heart of this sadist. For some time, the officers and soldiers sighed with relief as Sipailov, so it seemed, devoted all his time to pretty little Mashenka.

However, according to eyewitnesses, the following scene eventually took place in Ungern's quarters. Mashenka had prepared a pie for the commanders. Ungern made an exception and allowed for some champagne to be drunk. Sipailov was extremely lively and unexpectedly kind. When the officers asked him to call Mashenka to thank her for such an amazing dish, Sipailov turned pale, went out, and came back with a strange bag in his hands. He pulled the bloody, severed head of his lover out of it and, with a yellow gleam in his eyes, dumped it on the table in front of the dumbfounded officers. He added laconically: "Bolshevik agent."

Mongolia was still in good hands, but the situation became increasingly ominous. The Bolsheviks were winning on all fronts. Ungern gathered his officers at his quarters in Urga:

"Gentlemen, bad news. Ataman Semenov has left Chita. The Soviet General Blücher, a Red Teutonic pig, has just occupied the city. His headquarters are in Verkhneudinsk near Lake Baikal. All of Siberia is now Bolshevik."

"And Crimea?"

"Crimea is gone. The remnants of Wrangel's army have fled on the ships of our Western pseudo-allies."

The situation was as simple and deadly as the tip of a sword. The Baron summed up in one simple phrase:

"Gentlemen, there is only one combat-ready White army left: the First Asian Cavalry Division."

“Well, we are the last ones then.”

“This is a catastrophe.”

“No, Boris Ivanovich, it is not a catastrophe. It is an honor.”

For Ungern, Honor meant Faithfulness. Or, as the profound contemporary poetess Savitri Devi Mukherji said on an altogether similar matter: “Faithful when all become unfaithful—while we never forget, never forgive.”

The storm clouds were gathering. Jean Mabire’s book on Baron Ungern describes Ungern’s last meeting with Kutuktu before the Khan of War left Urga forever to move North, to Siberia, where he would put up one last fight against the Bolsheviks.

“Kutuktu, the Living Buddha, took his place. His face, in black glasses, was impenetrable as always, but his terrible fatigue was felt in all its force. Only with great difficulty did the old man restrain a nervous shiver. A huge throne with a high gilded back, littered with yellow silk pillows. Ungern bowed. He glanced around. The Baron was not one to deliver long speeches, he restricted himself to an announcement of his decision:

‘In a few days I am leaving Mongolia. I am going to Baikal to fight our common enemy, the Reds. Your country is henceforth free, and its sons, scattered around the world, should return to their Homeland. Soon the Empire of Genghis Khan will be reborn. You must preserve the freedom that we have won.’

But in his [Kutuktu’s] soul, a storm raged: without Ungern’s support he was nothing, just a blind old man, too feeble and impotent to drive young revolutionaries like Sukhbaatar and Choibolsan out of the country. Kutuktu asked the Baron to follow him into his office to talk one-on-one.

The divine Kutuktu walked over to a safe oddly framed against the oriental decor of the room. He fumbled with the lock for a long while. Finally, a heavy door slowly opened...Kutuktu reached up the

metal shelves for a casket carved out of ivory. Inside was a ruby ring with a solar sign, the Hackenkreuz, the symbol of ancient Aryan conquerors.

‘Genghis Khan never took this ring off of his right hand.’

Roman Fedorovich von Ungern-Sternberg stared at the jewel in a daze. As if in a dream, he extended his hand to Kutuktu. The old man was shaking and hardly managed to put the ring of the great conqueror onto the Baron’s finger. The Living Buddha blessed Ungern. Putting his hands on his head, he pronounced:

‘You will not die. You will be re-incarnated in a more perfect form of being. Remember this, living god of war, Khan to whom Mongolia is owed.’

Ungern felt as if the ring was burning his hand.

The Prince of Mongolia and loyal vicar of Kutuktu went out of the palace of Nogon-Orgo. The Lamas parted in front of him. In his resolutely ringing spurs, Ungern swiftly exited the corridor, never once turning back, and went beyond the palace, where he powerlessly collapse into the back seat of a car.

‘To headquarters’, he told Makeev.

The Baron felt the circle closing.”

Ungern’s forces once again marched onto Russian land. Now it was no longer a war they were waging, but guerrilla operations. Nevertheless, Ungern very seriously worried the Reds. He appeared where least expected, like lightning, suddenly, and would leave destruction and death in his wake. For him, the God of War, this was natural. The best units of the Red Army in Siberia were thrown at him, and General Blücher was made personally responsible for the whole operation.

But this was already agony. In the material world, everything reaches its fateful, fatal point. Ungern, however, was submerged in another reality, where he saw pictures of triumph and victory and the realization of a cherished dream. His being imperceptibly passed on to another, subtle plane which began to interfere with ordinary reality. His subordinates increasingly came to understand that their commander was insane.

Ungern rose, brought out maps, and unfurled them. Laying them out on the grass, with a bamboo cane he traced an imaginary route. He told his faithful assistant, General Rezukhin:

‘More fantasy, Boris Ivanovich! We go up to Selenga. It’s worse with Urga. We need to choose. Remnants of the White armies are hiding in western Mongolia. They will start to flock to us. Not all the Atamans and Cossacks have died. Together we will go further to the west. Now we are in Altai amidst mountains, caves, gorges, and shepherds who still believe in the incarnated god of war. We can easily cross the border of western Turkestan.’

‘In Xingjiang the Chinese will arrest you.’

‘We’ll deal with them quickly and head further south. We have to go through China. Does such a possibility scare you, Boris Ivanovich? The country is falling apart, revolution is in full swing. The only people we’ll come across are cowardly looters and deserters. All together it’s some thousand kilometers, and we are in an impregnable fortress. And we can start everything all over again. Absolutely everything.’

‘Tibet?’

‘Yes. The roof of the world. The Dalai Lama, the highest priest of Buddhism, is in Lhasa. Kutuktu occupies the third tier in the hierarchy compared to him. I made a mistake in the very beginning: the center of Asia is not in Mongolia. Mongolia is only the outer circle, the Shield. We should go to Tibet.’

The baron slapped the map with his bamboo stick right on the mountain chain of the Himalayas.

‘There, among the peaks, we will find people who have not forgotten their Aryan ancestors. On the dizzying border of India and China, my empire will be reborn. We will speak Sanskrit and live according to the principles of the Rig Veda. We will gain the law that Europe has lost. And once again the light of the North will shine. The eternal law, dissolved in the waters of the Ganges and Mediterranean, will prevail.’

The baron rose. His eyes shined. His voice broke into a rasp. A light stubble covered his sunken, fatigued cheeks. He threw back his hair, revealing an enormous forehead. He was the lone and fragile commander of a people absorbed by the shadow of centuries. He continued:

‘My Order will be on the mountain tops. Between Nepal and Tibet, I will open a school where I will teach strength, which is needed more than wisdom.’

With feverishly shining eyes, he shouted:

‘Everything is ready! They are waiting for me in Lhasa! I will reveal the secret of the runes that came from the North and hidden in the secret caches of temples. My Order of warrior-monks will be transformed into an army the likes of which have never been seen before. Asia, Europe, and America will tremble.’

‘No’, Rezukhin said.

For the first time, a little general had dared to stand up to Ungern. But this time, it was beyond his own power. He could no longer obey unconditionally. He forgot about discipline and friendship. His hands trembled, his eyes filled with tears. He repeated:

‘No, Roman Fedorovich, no.’

The Baron winced and looked at him. It was as if the word “no” had suddenly destroyed his dream, as if a runaway avalanche had swept away his Buddhist temple perched on a cliff and he flew into the abyss with his mills for prayers and bonzes in saffron robes.

‘I don’t understand your plans’, Rezushin, ‘I know only one army – the Tsarist. And one religion – Christianity. But that is not the point. The point is that we will never make it to Lhasa. Look at the map. We can’t cross Chinese Turkestan. And Manchuria is just a stone’s throw away. It’s enough to just head East.’

‘Never!’, the Baron cried out, ‘Only Tibet!’

Ungern was almost alone, if not for the lot of those who had not been killed and who remained loyal, who had Honor, like him, and Faithfulness too. Ungern rode across the Altai highlands on his favorite filly, Masha, and visions overcame him.

“Here on the fortress monastery flies a banner with the golden horseshoe and solar sign of Genghis Khan. The waves of the Baltic Sea break against the mass of Tibet. The ascent, the eternal ascent to the roof of the world, where there is light and force. Ascent...”

The grey horse stumbled on a stone. The dream disappeared, absorbed by mirage that enveloped the sweltering earth.

The dreams of the God of War were a premonition of what is sure to happen – not now, but on another turn of the Eternal Return. He who is truly alive will never know death.

1921. The end. Betrayal. Ungern was captured by the Reds. General Blücher had ordered that Ungern be treated like a Soviet officer. The Red Guards took him to the company command post of the revolutionary military committee of the Yenisei.

Blücher personally met Ungern and proposed that he join the Bolsheviks. Both spoke in German. Blücher spoke of Eurasianists, National Bolshevism, and a special line in the Soviet leadership, a national one, which was merely superficially covered with “Marxist phraseology”, and which was striving to build a gigantic, continental, Traditionalist state not only in Mongolia, but throughout all of Eurasia. Blücher promised the Baron full amnesty and a high position. At the same time, in a secret department of the

OGPU, headed by the Martinist Gleb Boki, plans were being developed for an expedition to Tibet, for the transformation of spiritual Bolshevism into a new kind of spiritual reality.

The Baron refused all the offers. Or at least that's what official history maintains. On September 12th, 1921, Baron Ungern-Sternberg was shot. The God of War was dead.

But do Gods die? If you are asking this, you are absolutely right. They can go away, but they cannot die.

To this day, a legend circulates through Mongolian and Buryat religious circles: "From the North came a white warrior who raised the Mongols, called on them to break the chains of slavery fettering their free land. This white warrior was the embodiment of Genghis Khan, and he predicted the coming of an even greater one..."

The "even greater one" is the Tenth Avatar, the Avenger, the Triumphant, the Fearsome Judge. All Traditions call him by different names. But the essence does not change. The defeat of "ours" is only an eschatological illusion. To embrace it is immoral. Our duty is to stand to the end. It does not matter if we lose every last one and everything lovable. Our Honor is in Faithfulness.

To challenge the doom of the dark ages – this gesture itself already harbors the highest reward.

And then a little later the avengers will catch up...the Last Battalion...the Wild Hunt of Odin. "Our" forces – with a golden banner flaunting the black rune UR, the sign of the Cosmic Midnight, the personal standard of the God of War, Baron Roman Fedorovich Ungern-Sternberg, harbinger of the Avatar.

Share this:

Christian Metaphysics: The Essence of the Problem

November 5, 2017

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Introduction/chapter 1 of *Metafizika Blagoi Vesti* [The Metaphysics of the Gospel] (1994) in *Absoljutnaia Rodina* [Absolute Homeland] (Moscow: Arktogetia, 1999).

Christianity is that tradition whose metaphysical dimension has been studied least of all. This is quite a paradox since one would think that such a deep study of Christianity, the religion of the West, would attract all those interested in metaphysics and who, following Guénon, are trying to make sense of the most profound aspects of Tradition. Nevertheless, the disputes surrounding Christianity in Traditionalist circles are, as a rule, limited to fairly secondary, practical issues regarding the virtual initiation of the sacraments, the absence of an idea of cyclical time, etc. In all of this, one can see a tacit consensus among Traditionalists that Christianity is nothing more than a reduced, incomplete tradition whose esotericism has been practically lost, and whose metaphysical content cannot be detached from the dense veil of exoteric scholastic theology and the hazy subjective intuitions of mystics. All attempts to identify any consistency between the basic principles of Christianity and the conceptual categories of other, more metaphysically developed traditions (primarily Hinduism) have yielded rather poor results and have been based on strained interpretations and biased urges to arrive at any cost at conclusions which match Guénon's own ideas (this is clearest of all in the book by Abbot Henri Stéphane, *Introduction à l'ésotérisme chrétien* [1]).

These circumstances, however, can be explained quite simply. The problem is that the Guénonian approach has spread only in narrow circles of the intellectual elite of the West, where by Christianity is usually understood, in the best case, Catholicism. But the specificity of Catholicism is such that, from the moment that the Western Church fell away from the Eastern Church, Catholicism built its dogmatic and intellectual foundation on a conscious rejection of the metaphysical content of Christianity. All the scholastic constructs were essentially an ambition to develop a slender theological doctrine while completely ignoring the ontological and metaphysical elements which were in fact present in the Christian tradition before the schism and preserved even afterwards. Of course, they survived exclusively in the Eastern Church, i.e., in the bosom of Orthodoxy. But Catholics, and even the most profound among them, seem to be unaware of this.

Orthodoxy, for its part, despite having preserved ontological and metaphysical wholeness, from a certain time onward could no longer assert its metaphysical content (i.e., actual Christian metaphysics) in clear categories. Shortly after the “Palamite disputes” when Orthodox esotericism experienced its last dazzling rise in history, this line was somewhat marginalized and “frozen”, as priority was given to the exoteric sides of the Church. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, many Russian theologians and even secular philosophers, intuitively surmising the special metaphysical nature of Orthodoxy, attempted to formulate certain principles for reviving the forgotten dimension of this tradition. However, most of these attempts did not yield serious results since none of them were familiar with the works of Guénon. Hence why only now, in our opinion, is it possible to acquire adequate knowledge of the most important proportions of the structure of fully-fledged metaphysics.

It can be said that although Western Traditionalists had the intellectual apparatus developed by Guénon, they did not have an adequate object for applying such, since Catholicism fundamentally prohibits one from going from the exoteric to the esoteric and metaphysical levels and, moreover, places insurmountable obstacles along the way. The Orthodox had and have a fully-fledged object, the Orthodox Christian Church Tradition and a full, irreducible dogma, but they have hitherto lacked an adequate metaphysical apparatus. Thus, for two opposite reasons, both in West and East the most widespread, well known, familiar, and close tradition – Christianity – has remained the most unknown, mysterious, and closed, all the while as Traditionalists rather well mastered Islamic metaphysics, Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, and even some archaic cults. The distant and exotic paradoxically became dearer to modern scholars nominally belonging to Christian civilization than “their own,” the familiar and close.

Be that as it may, Russians’ first acquaintance with the ideas of Guénon [2] now allows us to chart our way out of this impasse and to try to compare the overall metaphysical picture with the dogma of Orthodox Christianity. One should not be mistaken as to the simplicity of such a study. The near complete absence of references to Orthodoxy among Traditionalist authorities makes this task extremely difficult and risky. Nevertheless, without claiming final truth on this matter and all the while leaving the way open for alternative pursuits, we will try in this work to understand the metaphysical nature of Orthodoxy and, as follows, arrive at a formulation and recognition of the essence of Christian metaphysics.

Footnotes:

[1] abbe Henri Stéphane, Introduction à l'ésotérisme chrétien, Paris, 1979.

[2] At the present moment, the following books of R. Guénon have been published in Russian: The Crisis of the Modern World (Moscow, 1992), The King of the World in the journal Voprosy filosofii from 1993; The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times (Moscow, 1994), Fundamental Symbols of the Sacred Science (Moscow, 1996), and articles in the journal Milyi Angel No. 1, in the journals Voprosy filosofii, Literaturnoe obozrenie, and Volshebnaia Gora (chapters from the books An Introduction to the Study of the Hindu Doctrines, Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power, and The Symbolism of the Cross, etc.)

© Jafe Arnold – All Rights Reserved. No reproduction without expressed permission.

CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Description of the problem and starting positions

Christianity does not have a dogmatic cosmology. Theology, soteriology, teachings about the soul, and moral are all clearly described. Dogmatic teaching about the structure of the historical process is also well-defined. But there is no clear codification of physics, matter, botany, and biology.

We can propose a conditional structure with cosmology as basis and theology as superstructure. However, we do not have to interpret these two concepts in the Marxist way, which posits that the base is more important. Indeed, we might argue that the reverse is true, but what is now more important is to impartially conceive this structure.

This allows modern Christians to combine 'faith' with 'science'. While this is difficult to do in the area of history, biblical chronology, or teachings about the soul, it appears to be easy when physics, chemistry, or zoology are concerned. However, the key word here is 'appears'.

We will formulate our question: is Christianity compatible with modern science?

We definitely know two positions that exhaust both parties:

- Scientist themselves condescendingly consider Christianity to be a 'myth' and its ideas about the world to be 'pre-science' (the premodern paradigm);
- Christians believe, that 'faith' and 'science' do not contradict each other and that Christianity is a moral-ethic or even soteriological (to fundamentalists) superstructure on top of physical 'objective' knowledge about the world (some hope, that with the development of science Christianity will come even closer to religion, "I believe in the one Big Bang" etc.).

The third position, which would posit criticism of science from the position of Christianity, is either absent or exists in an embryonic stage (the works of father Pavel Florensky [1] are interesting in this context).

However, it is this third position that interests us in this lecture.

Cosmology and ideas about the nature of the world in the early Christian period

There is no dogmatic cosmology in the Bible or the Gospels. Nothing is said about atoms, elements, about evolution, species of animals etc. However, Christianity must operate with some kind of ideas about the world and its essence by virtue of it being a universal worldview.

Through history and other circumstances, these ideas were to be those of the Greek culture of the Hellenic era (the first few centuries after a.d.). It is on this Greek science that Christianity based itself. But was everything adopted? And what cosmologies were taken as being fundamental? This is most important.

First, there were three alternative approaches to the cosmos in the Hellenic world:

- An atomist approach, which was materialistic and founded on a belief in evolution and progress from the bottom up (self-evolution). It was represented by Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius etc.
- An Aristotelian approach, which held that the divine order is eternal is inherent in both the world and the godhead;
- A Platonic (and Neoplatonic) approach, according to which the world has been created by the Demiurge in accordance with an eternal plan that is manifested in eternal ideas.

Christianity initially rejected the first and accepted the other two in combination and in part. This is an extremely important moment for our examination of this subject.

What is more, during the integration of Aristotelianism and Platonism quite significant corrections were made: the removal of polytheistic components (of nature deities) and the eternity of the world. The figure of the transcendent Demiurge was not present in these models. Its introduction significantly corrected the whole picture.

The main idea of Aristotelianism was the divine order, which orientated itself on the idea that every object has its proper place. All objects try to occupy that place but disturb each other, which is the

nature of movement. Among different reasons for events, the most important is the *causa finalis*, i.e.: in whose name? Why? Where to? This is related to all objects: their goal (natural place) is also the reason of their existence. Furthermore, we find teachings about God as the unmoved mover. The of the real as consisting of form and matter. Logic as the fundamental law of thought, based on three sublaws: $A=A$, not- A , either A or not A . This predetermines the fully determined model of the cosmos.

Platonism proposed another structure. God is located in the world but beyond its borders, to be more precise on the on the highest boundary of the world, where the Unmanifest (apophatic) borders on manifestation. The world is the process of gradual descent, cooling, coalescence, and manifestation of ideas and eidoses (the monad). The lowest boundary is matter, which is an expression of pure non-existence (or evil, which has no existence and is insignificant). A hierarchy of intermediate beings exists between bodies and God: of souls, heroes, daimonic entities, angels, archangels, and “gods”. The world is a hierarchical pyramid, from which every corporeal entity can ascend through its spirit-essence further up to the hierarchy of light and directly to God. The soul of man is an idea that has descended to a body, after which it returns to its source star.

Christianity’s corrections to Aristotelianism coalesced into the following: the world is not eternal (in contrast to Aristotle) because the unmoved mover is not within, but without. Therefore, the world has a beginning and an end. But natural places, logic, form, and matter in objects remains, but not as natural attributes of the cosmos, but as a trace of the Creator. God created the world from the very beginning in an ordered and planned fashion, but, in contrast to Aristotle, the world can lose this order and slip into the abyss, as it is not independent and cannot stand on its own. By itself (without God) it will fall down. This Christian Aristotelianism was developed by saint John Damascene in Orthodoxy and Thomas Aquinas in Catholic scholasticism.

Corrections to Platonism are: God is not located on the edge of the world, but beyond the boundary of the world that separates it from the act of creation (Let there Be!), a metaphysical interpretation of the latter that was unknown and foreign to Platonism itself. Eternity is split in two: the world and human souls, as well as creatures of the ethereal world (angels) have a beginning, but (!) no end. In all other respects, the Platonic cosmic hierarchy is integrated. The place of spirits and gods is taken by angels. It is important to note, that angels are constructed and thus occupy an intermediate place between God and the natural world, i.e. they fulfil a physical function by uniting the uncreated with the corporeal. Angels are a fundamentally important element of the physical image of the world to Christians. It is angels who make the earth shake, send pestilences and trials, bring down fire (on Sodom and Gomorrah) etc. After a third of the angels fell, they (demons) fell down to earth and under the earth and... are responsible for the lowest and most corporeal forms of life. Angels save the physical structure of the world, demons despoil it. Angels and demons jointly play a fundamental role in the causal structure of the cosmos. Therefore, the world is not neutral: an Angel can be hidden behind anything, but more often than not it

is a demon. This is where the imperative of battle and victory against the world (those parts of the cosmos where the influence of demons is strong) comes from.

All of this entirely persists in Orthodox asceticism, but one might get the impression that this is only of relevance to the soul. In early Christianity (up to the New Era, about which we will speak later) the cosmos was also interpreted in the same way: it was split between angels and demons and as the end of times draws nearer (in the Christian interpretation of history) the nature of the world itself changes: demonic influence grows.

Modernity and its cosmos

In the late middle ages (the 16th century) and the New Era (the 17th century), modern science begins to appear. This means that the image of the world (and of the cosmos, nature, and physics) is changing. This change has clearly visible features. Aristotelianism (which was dominant in scholasticism) is the subject of a deconstruction, but there is no return to pure Platonism. Something new appears, but it is neither Aristotelianism nor Platonism. What is it? We return to the past: it is a model that had been rejected by Christianity, namely that of pre-Socratic atomism, Epicureanism, and Lucretian evolutionism. It is this that becomes the fundamental basis of modern science. The world is not created from the top (Platonism) nor is it divine by itself (Aristotelianism): matter develops and creates objects consisting of a game of atoms by itself. Atoms randomly form systems. Therefore, objects have no natural place and movement has no *causa finalis*, but only a *causa causalis* of the reason (why?) but not of the goal (to what end?) of movement.

Galileo Galilei was one of the first to expound this programme of the New Era, which was later picked up by Francis Bacon, Descartes, Newton, Spinoza etc.

In the first stages of this new paradigm, God and Christianity are not rejected. On the contrary, the rejection of Platonism and Aristotelianism is seen as a cleansing of pagan traces from Christianity and the sacrality of the cosmos. God becomes the 'god' of the Deists: the reason (*causa*) for the organisation of the world, but not its goal. Step by step the existence of angels and demons (who turn from cosmological agents into psychological metaphors) is accomplished. The world turns into a mechanism and is 'de-enchanted'. Protestantism and its rationalisation are even more beneficial to the intellectual climate by rejecting miracles, mysteries, icons, the Eucharist, and the church itself.

But this is the most interesting. Having demonstrated a 'Hellenistic' cosmos, the New Era started on the church and eventually on God himself. God became unnecessary to the new atomist cosmology and to the new rationalist science, and the church turned into a redundant institute thrown to the wayside, either twisted (in the US and Europe) or nearly destroyed (in the Soviet Union).

We can, of course, consider this to be a pure coincidence: the rejection of Aristotelianism (and Platonism) is one thing and the transition to atomism and mechanism (the objective development of scientific knowledge) is one thing, and de-Christianisation is something else entirely (being the result of subjective political and social processes). But these two events are so tightly interrelated conceptually, theoretically, and historically that pure coincidence is too unlikely. We are dealing with an interwoven phenomenon: a change of foundation (cosmology, physics) is accompanied by a change of superstructure.

From this point we can extract a fundamental conclusion: the significance of pre-modern cosmology (i.e. the Christian interpretation of the cosmos, matter, and physics that was dominant from its beginning to the end of the Renaissance, or 16 centuries) was far larger and closely linked to dogmatics (i.e. with the superstructure of theology, soteriology etc.) than is commonly thought. By destroying the Christian cosmos, New Era scientists have destroyed Christianity itself. And with success.

Conclusion: science can be Christian (in which case it must work with the Aristotelian-Platonic cosmological model), non-Christian, or anti-Christian. Non-Christian science is the cosmology of Hinduism, Buddhism, Daoism, and other non-Christian cultures. But Western-European science is not just non-Christian: it is anti-Christian, it was created as a project to destroy the Christian understanding of the world's structures and its development vector, which has led to the current technocentric society, can be viewed from theological positions, i.e. from the position of the superstructure, as the triumph of a kind of anti-religion, and, consequently, as the victory of a 'demonic philosophy' in the form of modern science.

Conclusion: what is to be done?

The Christian's natural question is: what is to be done? How should I act?

If one takes the third position on religion and modern science, life will become difficult (perhaps even unbearable). In this case, we must not only distrust the ideology of the modern (definitely non-Christian, often directly anti-Christian) society, but also the world itself, which, if we think about it, is pushed onto so heavily onto us by the entire structure of upbringing, education, study, and culture that we are convinced that it is reality, nature, existence, truth. One can debate an ideology (although this is

difficult, if it is a totalitarian one like all Modern ideologies: communism, fascism, and the most totalitarian one of all, liberalism!), but to distrust one's own sensory organs, to see that which 'isn't' behind 'natural' phenomena (as was said to us by our parents and teachers), i.e. the cosmological power of angels and demons is a direct road to insanity.

I do not know the answer to this question, as it can neither be easy nor understood. I can only express certain assumptions without being confident in neither their effectivity nor their ability to change anything.

First, we must give ourselves the task of fundamentally researching the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. This demands effort, but it is the foundation of Christian thought. Without Plato, the fundamental theological theses of the Cappadocian school, or even the most fundamental teachings about the Trinity, creation, etc., to say nothing of the Aeropagites, asceticism, or hesychasm would have no foundation at all. The fundamentals of Christian theology were developed by the Platonists. And it is Platonic cosmology (with Christian corrections) that was patched into this philosophy. In the Christian context, this corpus is most clearly represented by the Aeropagites, in the West by Scotus Eriugena.

Second, we must turn our attention to the fully developed criticism of Modernity by the postmodernists. In general, they do not just try to unmask Modernity, but to transcend it in a more saturated intellectual Satanism by leading materialism and immanentism to their logical limits. But such postmodernist radicality helps us to understand the scientific structure of the New Era. Here we observe the artificial and even falsified character of the evidential basis of the creators of the world's scientific image. For example, Paul Feierabend shows that Galilei just falsified his experiments, while Bruno Latour shows in excruciating detail what tricks and swindles the creators of the scientific image of the world and the founders of the first laboratories turned to. In general, the postmodernists show very convincingly that the scientific image of the world is an ideological construct, a collective psychological suggestion, and the result of mass hypnosis. And here it is high time to remember the function of devils in Christian cosmology: Modernity is the philosophy of the devil, and knowledge of this fact is no less correct in the area of the 'physical sciences' than in religion, theology, or politics.

Conclusion: the modern scientific image of the world is part of the plan of the Antichrist and a layer of his consciousness. It is not important as to whether it is his main part or not. What is important, is that it is a part. But there just is no universal and generally clear plan of battle against the Antichrist; it cannot and should not exist. Otherwise, the last eschatological, apocalyptic trial would not be as difficult and as decisive.

Translated from the Russian by V.A.V.

Translator's notes:

[1]: Pavel Aleksandrovich Florensky (1882-1937) was an Orthodox priest, theologian, physicist, poet, and martyr who died at the hands of the NKVD. What Dugin is referring to here are Florensky's works in which he attempts to fuse modern science with Christian conceptions of nature and the universe, which include *Оправдание космоса* (Justification of the Cosmos) and *Мнимости в геометрии* (Imaginary Numbers in Geometry). – V.A.V.

Civilization as political concept

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Civilization as political concept

Interview with the leader of the International “Eurasian Movement”, a philosopher, and a professor at Moscow State University Alexander Dugin.

Interviewed by the Global Revolutionary Alliance’s own Natella Speranskaja.

- The crisis of identity, with which we faced after the Cold War and the collapse of the communist world, is still relevant. What do you think is capable of lifting us out of this crisis – a religious revival or creation of a new political ideology? Which of the options are you inclined to yourself?

- After the collapse of communism came the phase of the “unipolar moment” (as Charles Krauthammer called it). In geopolitics, this meant the victory of unilateralism and Atlanticism, and because the pole was left alone, the West has become a global phenomenon. Accordingly, the ideology of liberalism (or more accurately, neo-liberalism) is firmly in place crushing the two alternative political theories that existed in the twentieth century – communism and fascism. The Global liberal West has now defined culture, economics, information and technology, and politics. The West’s claims to the universalism of its values, the values of Western modernity and the Postmodern era, has reached its climax.

Problems stemming from the West during the “unipolar moment” has led many to say that this “moment” is over, that he could not yet be a “destiny” of humanity. That is, a “unipolar moment” should be interpreted very broadly – not only geopolitical, but also ideologically, economically, axiologically, civilization wide. The crisis of identity, about which you ask, has scrapped all previous identities – civilizational, historical, national, political, ethnic, religious, cultural, in favor of a universal planetary Western-style identity – with its concept of individualism, secularism, representative democracy, economic and political liberalism, cosmopolitanism and the ideology of human rights. Instead of a hierarchy of identities, which have traditionally played a large role in sets of collective identities, the “unipolar moment” affirmed a flat one-dimensional identity, with the absolutization of the individual singularity. One individual = one identity, and any forms of the collective identity (for example,

individual as the part of the religious community, nation, ethnic group, race, or even sex) underwent dismantling and overthrow. Hence the hatred of globalists for different kind of “majorities” and protection of minorities, up to the individual.

The Uni-polar Democracy of our moment - this is a democracy, which unambiguously protects the minority before the face of the majority and the individual before face of the group. This is the crisis of identity for those of non-Western or non-modern (or even not “postmodern”) societies, since this is where customary models are scrapped and liquidated. The postmodern West with optimism, on the contrary, asserts individualism and hyper-liberalism in its space and zealously exports it on the planetary scale.

However, it's not painless, and has caused at all levels it's own growing rejection. The problems, which have appeared in the West in the course of this “uni-polar moment”, forced many to speak, that this “moment's” conclusion, has not succeeded in becoming “the fate” of humanity. This, therefore, was the cost of the possibility of passage to some other paradigm...

So, we can think about an alternative to the “unipolar moment” and, therefore, an alternative to liberalism, Americanism, Atlanticism, Western Postmodernism, globalization, individualism, etc. That is, we can, and I think should, work out plans and strategies for a “post-uni polar world”, at all levels – the ideological and political, the economic, and religious, and the philosophical and geo-political, the cultural and civilizational, and technology, and value.

In fact, this is what I call multi-polarity. As in the case of uni-polarity it is not only about the political and strategic map of the world, but also the paradigmatic philosophical foundations of the future world order. We can not exactly say that the “uni-polar moment” has finally been completed. No, it is still continuing, but it faces a growing number of problems. We must put an end to it – eradicate it. This is a global revolution, since the existing domination of the West, liberalism and globalism completely controls the world oligarchy, financial and political elites.

So they just will not simply give up their positions. We must prepare for a serious and intense battle. Multi-polarity will be recaptured by the conquered peoples of the world in combat and it will be able to arise only on the smoking ruins of the global West. While the West is still dictating his will to the rest, to talk about early multipolarity – you must first destroy the Western domination on the ground. Crisis – this is much, but far from all.

- If we accept the thesis of the paradigmatic transition from the current unipolar world order model to a new multi-polar model, where the actors are not nation-states, but entire civilizations, can it be said that this move would entail a radical change in the very human identity?

- Yes, of course. With the end of the unipolar moment, we are entering a whole new world. And it is not simply a reverse or a step back, but it is a step forward to some unprecedented future, however, different from the digital project of "lonely crowds", which is reserved for humanity by globalism. Multi-polar identity will be the complex nonlinear collection of different identities – both individual and collective, that is varied for each civilization (or even inside each civilization).

This is something completely new that will be created.

And the changes will be radical. We can not exclude that, along with known identities, civilizations, and offering of new ways ... It is possible that one of these new identities will become the identity of "Superman" – in the Nietzschean sense or otherwise (for example, traditionalist) ... In the "open society" of globalism the individual is, on the contrary, closed and strictly self-identical.

The multi-polar world's anthropological map will be, however, extremely open, although the boundaries of civilizations will be defined clearly. Man will again re-open the measurement of inner freedom – "freedom for", in spite of the flat and purely external liberal freedom – "freedom from" (as John Mill), Which is actually, not freedom, but its simulacrum, imposed for a more efficient operation of the planetary masses by a small group of global oligarchs.

- Alexander Gelevich Dugin, you are the creator of the theory of a multi-polar world, which laid the foundation from which we can begin a new historical stage. Your book "The theory of a multi-polar world" has been and is being translated into other languages. The transition to a new model of world order means a radical change in the foreign policy of nation-states, and in today's global economy, in fact, you have created all the prerequisites for the emergence of a new diplomatic language. Of course, this is a challenge of the global hegemony of the West. What do you think will be the reaction of your political opponents when they realize the seriousness of the threat posed?

- As always in the vanguard of philosophical and ideological ideas, we first have the effect of bewilderment, the desire to silence or marginalize them. Then comes the phase of severe criticism and rejection. Then they begin to consider. Then they become commonplace and a truism. So it was with many of my ideas and concepts in the past 30 years. Traditionalism, geopolitics, Sociology of imagination, Ethnosociology, Conservative Revolution, National Bolshevism, Eurasianism, the Fourth Political Theory, National-structuralism, Russian Schmittianism, the concept of the three paradigms, the eschatological gnosis, New Metaphysics and Radical Theory of the Subject, Conspiracy theories, Russian haydeggerianstvo, a post-modern alternative, and so on – perceived first with hostility, then partially assimilated, and finally became part of mainstream discourse in academia and politics of Russia, and in part, and beyond.

Each of these directions has their fate, but the diagram of their mastering is approximately identical. So it will be also with the theory of a multipolar world. It will be hushed up, and then demonized and fiercely criticized, and then they will begin to look at it closely, and then accepted. But for all this it is necessary to pay for it and to defend it in the fight. Arthur Rimbaud said that “the spiritual battle as fierce and hard, as the battle of armies.” For this we will have to struggle violently and desperately. As for everything else.

- In the “Theory of a multipolar world,” you write that in the dialogue between civilizations the responsibility is born by the elite of civilization. Do I understand correctly, it should be a “trained” elite, that is, the elite, which has a broad knowledge and capabilities, rather than the present “elite”? Tell me, what is the main difference between these elites?

- Civilizational elite – is a new concept. Thus far it does not exist. It is a combination of two qualities – deep assimilation of the particular civilizational culture (in the philosophical, religious, value levels) and the presence of a high degree “of drive,” persistently pushing people to the heights of power, prestige and influence. Modern liberalism channels passion exclusively in the area of economics and business, creating a preference for a particular social elevator and it is a particular type of personality (which is an American sociologist Yuri Slezkine called “mercurial type”).

The Mercurial elite of globalism, “aviakochevniki” mondialist nomadism, sung by Jacques Attali, should be overthrown in favor of radically different types of elites. Each civilization can dominate, and other “worlds”, not only thievish, mercurial shopkeepers and cosmopolitans. Islamic elite is clearly another – an example of this we see in today’s Iran, where the policy (Mars) and economics (Mercury) are subject to spiritual authority, of the Ayatollah (Saturn).

But the “world” is only a metaphor. Different civilizations are based on different codes. The main thing is that the elite must be reflected in the codes themselves, whatever they may be. This is the most important condition. The will to power inherent in any elite, shall be interfaced with the will to knowledge, that is intellectualism and activism in such a multipolar elite should be wedded. Technological efficiency and value (often religious) content should be combined in such an elite. Only such an elite will be able to fully and responsibly participate in the dialogue of civilizations, embodying the principles of their traditions and engaging in interaction with other civilizations of the worlds.

- How can you comment on the hypothesis that the return to a bipolar model is still possible?

- I think not, practically or theoretically. In practice, because today there is no country that is comparable to the basic parameters of the U.S. and the West in general. The U.S. broke away from the rest of the world so that no one on its own can compete with them. Theoretically, only the West now has a claim to universality of its values, whereas previously Marxism was regarded as an alternative. After the collapse of the Soviet Union it became clear that universalism is only liberal, capitalist. To resist Western imperialism there can only be a coalition of large spaces – not the second pole, but immediately multiple poles, each of them with its own strategic infrastructure and with a particular civilizational, cultural and ideological content.

- How real is the sudden transition to a non-polar model? What are the main disadvantages of this model?

- Passage to a non-polar model, about which leaders are increasingly talking of in the Council on Foreign Relations (Richard Haass, George Soros, etc.), means the replacement of the facade of a uni-polar hegemony, the transition from the domination based on military and strategic power of the United States and NATO (hardware) to dispersed domination of the West as a whole (software). These are two versions – hard-hegemony and soft-hegemony. But in both cases the West, its civilization, its culture, its philosophy, its technologies, its political and economic institutes and procedures come out as the standard universal model. Over the long term, this will indicate the transfer of power to a “world government”, which will be dominated by all the same Western elites, the global oligarchy. It will then discard its mask and will act directly on behalf of the transnational forces. In some sense non-polarity is worse than uni-polarity, though, it would seem hard to believe.

Non-polarity itself, and even more sharply and rapidly, will not yet begin. For this, the world must go through the turmoil and trials until a desperate humanity itself cried for the world elite with a prayer for

salvation. Prior to that, to weaken the power of the United States, world disasters occur, and war. Non-polar world under the control of a world government, consisting of direct representatives of the global oligarchy, is expected by many religious circles as the coming "of the kingdom of the Antichrist."

As for the "shortcomings" of such a model, I believe that it is just "a great parody of" the sacred world empire, which Rene Guenon warned of in his work *The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times*. This will be a global simulacrum. To recognize these "deficiencies" will not be so easy, otherwise opposition "to the antichrist" would be too simple a matter, and the depth of his temptation would be insignificant.

The true alternative is a multi-polar world, everything else – evil in the truest sense of the word.

- The "counter-hegemony" by Robert Cox, who you mention in your book aims to expose the existing order in international relations and raise the rebellion against it. To do this, Cox called for the creation of counter-hegemonic bloc, which will include political actors who reject the existing hegemony. Have you developed the Fourth Political Theory as a kind of counter-hegemonic doctrine that could unite the rebels against the hegemony of the West?

- I am convinced that the Fourth Political Theory fits into the logic of building counter-hegemony, which Cox spoke of. By the way, also in the proximity of critical theory in the MO theory, and multi-polar world is a wonderful text by Alexandra Bovdunova, voiced at the Conference on the Theory of a multipolar world in Moscow, Moscow State University on 25-26 April 2012 .

4PT is not a complete doctrine, this is still the first steps toward the exit from the conceptual impasse in which we find ourselves in the face of liberalism, today rejected by more and more people around the world, in the collapse of the old anti-liberal political theories – Communism and Fascism. In a sense, the need for 4PT – is a sign of the times, and really can not be disputed by anyone. Another matter, what will be 4PT in its final form. The temptation appears to build it as a syncretic combination of elements of previous anti-liberal doctrines and ideologies ...

I am convinced that we should go another way. It is necessary to understand the root of the current hegemony. This coincides with the root of modernity as such, and it grows from the roots of modernity in all three pillars of political theories – liberalism, communism and fascism. To manipulate them to find an alternative to modernity and liberalism, respectively, and of the liberal hegemony of the West, is in

my view, pointless. We must move beyond modernity in general, beyond the range of its political actors – individual, class, nation, state, etc.

Therefore 4PT as the basis of a counter-hegemonic planetary front should be constructed quite differently. Like the theory of a multipolar world 4PT operates with a new concept – “civilization”, but 4PT puts special emphasis on the existential aspect of it. Hence the most important, the central thesis of 4PT that its subject is the actor - Dasein. Every civilization, its Dasein, which means that it describes a specific set of existentials. On their basis, should be raised a new political theory generalized at the following level into a “multipolar federation Of Dasein” as the concrete structure of counter – hegemony. In other words, the very counter-hegemony must be conceived existentially, as a field of war between the inauthentic globalization (global alienation) and the horizon of authentic peoples and societies in a multipolar world (the possibility of overcoming the alienation of civilizations).

- When we talk about cognitive uprising, however first of all, our actions should be aimed at the overthrow of the dictatorship of the West?

- The most important step is the beginning of the systematic preparation of a global revolutionary elite-oriented to multi-polarity 4PT. This elite must perform a critical function – to be a link between the local and global. At the local level we are talking about the masses and the clearest exponents of their local culture (religious leaders, philosophers, etc.). Often, these communities do not have a planetary perspective and simply defend their conservative identity before the onset of toxic globalization and Western imperialism.

Raising the masses and the traditionalist-conservatives to a realized uprising in the context of a complex union of a counter-hegemonistic block is extremely difficult. Simple conservatives and their supportive mass, for example, of the Islamic or Orthodox persuasion are unlikely to realize the necessity of alliances with the Hindus or the Chinese. This will be the play (and they are already actively playing it) of the globalists and their principle of “divide and conquer!” But the revolutionary elite, which is the elite, even within a particular traditionalist elite of society, should take the , heartfelt deep and deliberate feelings of local identity and correlate it within a total horizon of multi-polarity, and 4PT.

Without the formation of such a elite the revolt against the post-modern world and the overthrow of the dictatorship of the West will not take place. Every time and everywhere the West has a problem, he will come to the aid of anti-Western forces, which, however, will be motivated by narrow bills to specific civilizational neighbors – most often, just as anti-Western as they are. So it will be and already is

the instrumentalization of globalists of various conservative fundamentalist and nationalist movements. Islamic fundamentalists to help the West is one. European nationalists – is another. So a “unipolar moment” extends not only to exist in itself, but also playing the antagonistic forces against him. The overthrow of the dictatorship of the West will become possible only if this strategy will be sufficient enough to create or make appear a new counter-hegemonic elite. A initiative like Global Revolutionary Alliance – the unique example of really revolutionary and effective opposition to hegemony.

- You have repeatedly said that Eurasianism is a strategic, philosophical, cultural and civilizational choice. Can we hope that the political course chosen by Vladimir Putin (establishment of a Eurasian Union) is the first step towards a multipolar model?

- This is a difficult question. By himself, Putin and, especially, his environment, they act more out of inertia, without calling into question the legitimacy of the existing planetary status quo. Their goal – to win his and Russia’s rather appropriate place within the existing world order. But that is the problem: a truly acceptable place for Russia is not and can not exist, because the “uni-polar moment”, as well as the globalists stand for the desovereignization of Russia, eliminating it as an independent civilization, and strategic pole.

This self-destruction seems to suit, Dmitry Medvedev and his entourage (INSOR) for he was ready to reboot and go for almost all of it. Putin clearly understands the situation somewhat differently, and his criteria of “acceptability” is also different. He would most of all psychologically arrange a priority partnership with the West while maintaining the sovereignty of Russia. But this is something unacceptable under any circumstances to the unipolar globalists - practically or theoretically.

So Putin is torn between multipolarity, where he leads the orientation of sovereignty and Atlanticism, where he leads the inertia and the tireless work of a huge network of influence that permeates all of the structure of Russian society. Here’s the dilemma. Putin makes moves in both directions – he proclaims multi-polarity, the Eurasian Union, to protect the sovereignty of Russia, even spoke of the peculiarities of Russian civilization, strengthening vertical power, shows respect (if not more) to Orthodoxy, but on the other hand, surrounds himself with pro-American experts (eg, “Valdai Club”), rebuilds, education and culture under the globalistic Western models, has a liberal economic policy and suffers comprador oligarchs, etc.

The field for maneuver Putin is constantly shrinking. The logic of the circumstances pushes him to a more unambiguous choice. Inside the country this uncertainty of course causes growing hostility, and his legitimacy falls.

Outside the country the West only increases the pressure on Putin to persuade him towards globalism and the recognition of “unilateralism”, specifically – to cede his post to the Westerner Medvedev. So Putin, while continuing to fluctuate between multipolarity and Westernism, loses ground and support here and there.

The new period of his presidency will be very difficult. We will do everything we can to move it to a multipolar world, the Eurasian Union and 4PT. But we are not alone in Russian politics – against us for influence in Putin’s circles we have an army of liberals, agents of Western influence and the staff of the global oligarchy. For us, though, we have the People and the Truth. But behind them – a global oligarchy, money, lies, and, apparently, the father of lies. Nevertheless, vincit omnia veritas. That I have no doubt.

4pt

Counter-Hegemony in the Theory of the Multipolar World

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The most important aspect of the Theory of the Multipolar World (TMW) is the concept of counter-hegemony as first formulated in the context of the Critical Theory of International Relations (IR). In transitioning from Critical Theory to the Theory of the Multipolar World[i], this concept also undergoes a special sense of transformation which should be examined in more detail. In order to render such an analysis possible, we should first recall the main positions of the theory of hegemony with the framework of Critical Theory.

The Concept of Hegemony in Realism

Although the concept of hegemony in Critical Theory is based on Antonio Gramsci's theory, it is necessary to distinguish this concept's position on Gramscianism and neo-Gramscianism from how it is understood in the realist and neo-realist schools of IR.

The classical realists use the term "hegemony" in a relative sense and understand it as the "actual and substantial superiority of the potential power of any state over the potential of another one, often neighboring countries." Hegemony might be understood as a regional phenomenon, as the determination of whether one or another political entity is considered a "hegemon" depends on scale. Thucydides introduced the term itself when he spoke of Athens and Sparta as the hegemons of the Peloponnesian War, and classical realism employs this term in the same way to this day. Such an understanding of hegemony can be described as "strategic" or "relative."

In neo-realism, "hegemony" is understood in a global (structural) context. The main difference from classical realism lies in that "hegemony" cannot be regarded as a regional phenomenon. It is always a global one. The neorealism of K. Waltz, for example, insists that the balance of two hegemons (in a bipolar world) is the optimal structure of power balance on a world scale[ii]. R. Gilpin believes that hegemony can be combined only with unipolarity, i.e., it is possible for only a single hegemon to exist, this function today being played by the USA.

In both cases, the realists comprehend hegemony as a means of potential correlation between the potentials of different state powers.

Gramsci's understanding of hegemony is completely different and finds itself in a completely opposite theoretical field. To avoid the misuse of this term in IR, and especially in the TMW, it is necessary to pay attention to Gramsci's political theory, the context of which is regarded as a major priority in Critical Theory and TMW. Moreover, such an analysis will allow us to more clearly see the conceptual gap between Critical Theory and TMW.

Antonio Gramsci's Hegemony Concept

Antonio Gramsci based his theory, later known as Gramscianism, on his understanding of Marxism and its practical embodiment in history. As a Marxist, Gramsci was convinced that socio-political history is completely predetermined by the economic factor and, like all Marxists, he explains the superstructure (Aufbau) through the base (infrastructure). Bourgeois society is in essence a class society in which the processes of exploitation reach their most concentrated expression in the form of the ownership of the means of production and the appropriation of the surplus value arising in the production process by the bourgeoisie. Inequality in the economic sphere (the base) and the domination of Capital over Labor composes the essence of capitalism and accordingly determines all social, political, and cultural semantics (the superstructure).

This thesis is shared by all Marxists, and there is nothing new or original here. But then Antonio Gramsci asked: how was a proletarian socialist revolution possible in Russia where, from Marx's point of view (analyzing the situation in the Russian Empire in the 19th century from a prognostic perspective) and from the point of view of classical European Marxism from the beginning of the 20th century, the objective base (the underdevelopment of capitalist relations, a small proletariat, the predominance of the agricultural sector in the country's total GDP, the absence of bourgeois political system, etc) excluded the possibility of a Communist party coming to power? After all, Lenin made this possible and began to build socialism.

Gramsci understands this phenomenon as fundamentally important, calling it "Leninism". In Gramsci's understanding, Leninism was the vanguard, advanced action of a consolidated and strong political superstructure (in the form of the Communist Party of Bolsheviks) in seizing political power. Once such a vanguard becomes a relevant factor, and revolution is successful, then it should rapidly develop the base through the accelerated creation of the superstructures whose according economic realities have not

yet been implemented under capitalism, i.e., industrialization, modernization, “electrification”, “public education,” etc. Thus, Gramsci drew the conclusion that under certain circumstances politics (the superstructure) can stay ahead of the economy (the base). The Communist Party can “get in front” of the “natural” development of historical processes. Consequently, Leninism proves the existence of the significant autonomy of the superstructure in regards to the base.

But Leninism, as Gramsci understood it, was limited to the political segment of the superstructure, in which the functioning of law and government and the issue of domination are already solved. Gramsci insisted that the superstructure has yet another important segment which is not political in the fullest sense, i.e., not merely associated with political parties or bound to the issue of political power. Gramsci called this sphere “civil society.” Such a notion, however, should always be accompanied with the qualification of “civil society as understood by Gramsci”, for its meaning does not always coincide with the one that it is assigned in liberal theories. Gramsci’s civil society is the “zone of expansion” for the intellectual parts of society including science, culture, philosophy, art, analytics, journalism, etc. The Marxist, for Gramsci, relies on the regularity of the base in this domain, as for the whole superstructure. But...Leninism demonstrated that the regularity of the base, in some cases, is overcome by the relative autonomy of the superstructure, which advances ahead of the base’s processes. The experience of the Russian Revolution, as an historical example, demonstrated how politics is realized at the level of the superstructure. But here Gramsci emphasizes that, if this is so in the case of the political sphere of the superstructure, then why could something similar not happen at the level of “civil society?” It is at this point that Gramsci’s notion of “hegemony” appears.[iii] He successively outlines something analogous to the economic division of Capital vs. Labor in the base, or the contradiction between the bourgeois party and government vs. the proletarian party and government (as in the Soviet Union), can take place in the intellectual sphere (Gramsci’s “civil society”). This third realm of contradiction is termed “hegemony” by Gramsci, where bourgeois consciousness and proletarian consciousness vie for domination relatively autonomous from both politics and the economy.

Studying bourgeois sociology[iv], the German sociologist Werner Sombart showed that leisure is valuable for this third category, or third “class,” which partially possesses such comfort while other social groups either do not know or do not have such. Hegel’s *The Phenomenology of Spirit*[v] similarly says that the Slave operates not by his own consciousness, but the Master’s consciousness. As is known, this and other elements of Hegel formed the foundation for Marx’s communist ideology. Continuing this chain of thought, Gramsci concluded that the adoption or rejection of hegemony (bourgeois consciousness structures) does not and cannot directly depend on the fact of belonging to the bourgeois class (in the sense of the base) or from political involvement in a bourgeois party or administrative system. Being on the side of hegemony, or against it, according to Gramsci, is a free choice. As an intellectual chooses it consciously, he is transformed from a “traditional” intellectual into an “organic” intellectual, i.e., one who consciously takes his/her stance on hegemony.

This leads to an important conclusion. The intellectual may oppose bourgeois hegemony even while living comfortably in a society in which capitalist relations are the basis and bourgeois political domination prevails. The intellectual can reject or accept hegemony freely, i.e., he has a gap of freedom similar to the autonomy of the political in regards to the economic base (as seen in the Bolshevik experience in Russia). In other words, one can be the carrier of proletarian consciousness and stand on the side of the laboring class for a just society even while being at the heart of bourgeois society. Everything depends on the intellectuals' choice. Hegemony is thus a matter of conscience.

Gramsci himself came to such conclusions based on his analysis of political processes in Italy in the 1920's-30's[vi]. During this period, according to his analysis, the conditions prevailing in Italy were quite ripe for socialist revolution in terms of both the base (developed industrial capitalism and the sharpening of class contradictions and struggle) and the superstructure (the political successes of consolidated leftist parties). But, despite these seemingly favorable conditions, according to Gramsci's further analysis, leftist forces failed in the intellectual field. It was here that Italy was most oppressed by bourgeois hegemony, who constantly introduced bourgeois stereotypes and clichés into popular consciousness even though these contradicted economic and political realities and the popularity of active, anti-bourgeois circles. In Gramsci's view, Mussolini applied hegemony in his favor (fascism was disgusting for communists, who saw it as a form of domination by the bourgeois classes) and prevented an "artificial" socialist revolution from appearing in accordance with the natural historical course of events. In other words, despite waging (relatively) successful political battles, the Italian Communists overlooked "civil society", the intellectual sphere, and the "metapolitical" fight. Gramsci saw this as the cause of their defeat.

Gramscianism has since been adopted by the European Left (especially the New Left) and left-wing movements in Europe have applied Gramscianism in practice since the 1960's. The Leftist (Marxist) intellectuals (Sartre, Camus, Aragon, Foucault, etc.) were able to implant anti-bourgeois concepts and theories in the center of social and cultural life, thus taking advantage of publications, newspapers, clubs, and university departments which were integral parts of the capitalist economy, and they acted in the political context of the domination of the bourgeois system. They went on to prepare the events of 1968 which swept across Europe and the left turn of European politics in the 1970's. Just as Leninism proved in practice that the political segment of the superstructure has a certain degree of autonomy, in the sphere of which activism can accelerate the processes unfolding at the base, so did the Gramscianism of the New Left demonstrate the efficacy and practical value of an active intellectual strategy in practice.

Gramscianism in Critical Theory: the Left Pivot

The Gramscianism which we have described has been integrated into IR Critical Theory by its modern representatives such as Robert Cox[vii], Stephen Gill[viii], etc. In Postmodernism, the autonomy of “civil society” was furthered and, consequently, the phenomenon of the intellectuals’ choice of hegemony and the placement of epistemological straggles above political processes and economic structures in general preserved the continuity of Marxist, leftist discourse. In this view, capitalism is regarded as generally better (more “progressive”) than pre-capitalist socio-economic systems even if it is obviously worse in comparison to any post-capitalist (socialist and communist) model by which it is to be replaced. This explains the structure of the project of counter-hegemony[ix]. IR Critical Theory remains leftist in its understanding of the historical process. One can describe this perspective in the following way: according to the representatives of Critical Theory, hegemony (bourgeois society culminating in the hologram of bourgeois consciousness) replaces that which “hegemonized” it (types of pre-bourgeois formations with inherent forms of pre-modern collective consciousness) only then to be subverted by counter-hegemony which, upon victory, is to establish post-hegemony. In the Communist Manifesto[x], Marx and Engels themselves insisted on the different ways in which communists’ opposition to the bourgeoisie has nothing to do with the claims against the bourgeoisie advanced by anti-bourgeois feudalists, nationalists, Christian socialists, etc. Capitalism is pure evil which concentrates in itself (albeit not so clearly and explicitly) previous forms of social exploitation. In order to defeat this evil, it must first be allowed to fully manifest itself, and only then can it be eradicated, instead of retouching its most odious features which only delays the horizon of revolution and communism. This must be taken into account when considering the structure of the neo-Gramscian analysis of international relations.

This analysis divides all countries into those in which hegemony is obviously strengthened (developed capitalist countries featuring industrial economies, the domination of bourgeois parties in parliamentary democracies organized in accordance with the example of the nation-state, a developed market economy, and a liberal legal system) and those in which, by virtue of various historical circumstances, such factors have not appeared. The first group of countries are called the “developed democratic powers” and the second are “borderline cases,” “problematic areas,” or even categorized as “rogue states.” The leftist (Marxist, neo-Marxist, and Gramscian) analysis is totally applicable in the countries in which hegemony is strengthened. However, in the case of countries displaying “incomplete hegemony”, things should be regarded in a different way.

Gramsci himself places these countries under the “Caesarist” category (seeing the experience of fascist Italy as a clear reference). “Caesarism” can be regarded in a broad sense as any political system in which bourgeois relations exist in fragmented form while their full political arrangement (in the form of classic bourgeois-democratic states) has been delayed. In “Caesarism,” the main point is not authoritarian rule, but the delay of the full realization of a fully-fledged, Western-style capitalist system (both base and superstructure). The reasons for this “delay” can vary from dictatorial styles of government, clan elites,

and the presence of religious or ethnic groups in power to the cultural characteristic of a given society or the historical circumstances of a particular economic or geographical location, etc. What is first and foremost important is that in such a society hegemony acts both as an external force (from bourgeois states and societies) and as an internal opposition, which in one way or another is connected with external factors.

In IR, the neo- Gramscians insist that “Caesarism” is “incomplete hegemony.” Thus, its strategy is to ensure a balance between external and internal hegemonic pressures by granting certain concessions, all the while doing so only selectively in order to maintain power and prevent seizure by bourgeois political forces of the political superstructure presiding over the economic base of society. Caesarism is thus doomed to “transformism” (from the Italian *transformismo*), i.e., the permanent adjustment of hegemony, that very force which Caesarism constantly desires to delay or deflect down a false trajectory, the end of which is steadily approaching.

In this regard, IR Critical Theory considers “Caesarism” to be something that will sooner or later be eliminated by hegemony, as this phenomenon is nothing more than a “historical delay” rather than an alternative, i. e., a counter-hegemony in itself.

According to the representatives of modern IR Critical Theory, such “Caesarism” is obviously represented by most of the countries of the Third World and the major powers included in BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa).

Taking into account such characteristics, the limitations in such a conceptualization of counter-hegemony presented by the IR Critical Theory become clear as does the pure utopianism of alternative projects, such as Cox’s “counter-society”, which represents something expressionless and undefined. They proceed from the vague project of socio-political world order, which is supposed to appear “after liberalism”[xi] (Immanuel Wallerstein) and conform to the usual left-wing communist utopia. A similar version of counter-hegemony is also limited by the fact that it hastily pushes numerous other political phenomena, which are obviously unrelated to hegemony and lean towards alternative versions of world order, into the category of “Caesarism”, and thus “incomplete hegemony.” This deprives these alternatives of any consideration as to their development towards an effective counter-hegemonic strategy. Nonetheless, it is this general analysis of the structure of international relations in the light of neo-Gramscian methodology which constitutes an extremely important trajectory for developing the TMW.

However, in order to overcome the limitations inherent to Critical Theory and fully exploit the potential in neo-Gramscianism, we should qualitatively expand this approach, going beyond left (and even “leftist”) discourse, which places the entire structure in the zone of ideological sectarianism and marginal exoticism (where such is currently found). In this regard, invaluable assistance can be found in the ideas of the French philosopher Alain de Benoist.

“Right Wing Gramscianism” – Alain de Benoist’s Revision

Back in the 1980s, the French representative of the “New Right” (“Nouvelle Droite”), Alain de Benoist, directed attention towards Gramsci’s ideas from the point of view of their methodological capacity[xii]. Just like Gramsci, de Benoist revealed the centrality of meta-politics as a special area of intellectual activity that prepares (in the form of a “passive revolution”) further political and economic changes. The success of the “New Left” in France, and in Europe in general, only confirms the effectiveness of this approach.

Unlike the majority of French intellectuals of the second half of the 20th century, Alain de Benoist was not a supporter of Marxism, a fact which isolated his position. However, de Benoist nonetheless built his political philosophy upon a radical rejection of liberal and bourgeois values, a negation capitalism, individualism, modernism, as well as a rejection of geopolitical Atlanticism and Western Eurocentrism. Moreover, he contrasted “Europe” to the “West” as two antagonistic concepts. For de Benoist, Europe is the field of deployment of a special cultural Logos handed down from the Greeks which intensely combined the richness of the Celtic, Germanic, Latin, Slavic, and other European traditions. The “West”, on the other hand, is equivalent to the mechanistic, materialist, rationalist civilization based on the predominance of technology over other spheres. Alain de Benoist, like Oswald Spengler, understood the “West” as the “decline of Europe” and, along with F. Nietzsche and M. Heidegger, he is convinced of the need to overcome modernity as nihilism and “the abandonment of Being in the world” (Seinsverlassenheit). In this regard, the “West” is identical to the very liberalism, capitalism, and bourgeois society against which the New Right strove to fight. At the same time, although not being materialists, the New Right agreed with the key significance assigned by Gramsci and his followers to “civil society.” For example, Alain de Benoist came to the conclusion that the phenomenon which Gramsci called “hegemony” is a set of strategies, attitudes, and values which he considered to be “pure evil.” This led to the proclamation of the principle of “Gramscianism from the Right.”

This Gramscianism “of the right” means recognizing the autonomy of “civil society” as understood by Gramsci as well as identifying the phenomenon of hegemony in this sphere and the personal choice of one’s ideological position on the opposite side from hegemony. Alain de Benoist has published a

programmatic work entitled *Europe and the Third World – One and the Same Battle*[xiii] which entirely bases itself on the parallels between the struggle of the peoples of the Third World against bourgeois neocolonialism and the will of European nations to free themselves from the dictatorship of the bourgeois market society and the morality and praxis of traders, and replace such a system with heroic ethics[xiv] (Werner Sombart).

The crucial importance of this “right-wing Gramscianism” for TMW is that such an understanding of “hegemony” that allows one to transcend leftist and Marxist discourse and reject the bourgeois order at the base (economy) and the superstructure (politics and civil society) not after hegemony has become a total planetary and global factor, but in spite of it. Hence the extremely important nuance imbued with meaning in the title of de Benoist’s second programmatic work, *Against Liberalism*[xv], which contrasts to the neo-Marxist Immanuel Wallerstein’s *After Liberalism*[xvi]. For de Benoist, the “after” cannot be counted on. In any case, one must not let liberalism be allowed to become an accomplished fact. Liberalism must be opposed here and now and must be fought from any position at any point in the world. Hegemony attacks on a planetary scale and finds its bearers in the developed bourgeois societies as well as in those societies in which capitalism has not yet been definitively established. Therefore, counter-hegemony should be perceived as something beyond sectarian ideological restrictions; if we want to create a counter-hegemonic bloc, then it must include all anti-bourgeois, anti-capitalist forces whether of the left, right, or those without any kind of definitive classification (Alain de Benoist himself has constantly emphasized that the division between “left” and “right” is not only outdated, but also does not correspond to the real choice of position – today what is significantly more important is whether one acts for or against hegemony).

Alain de Benoist’s right Gramscianism takes us back to the Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels despite their rather exclusive and dogmatic appeal for the formation of a Global Revolutionary Alliance without “fellow travelers”. In contrast, we are dealing with one which unites all opponents of capitalism and hegemony and everyone who is essentially against this force. It is thus unimportant what is taken to be the positive alternative, since in this situation the presence of a common enemy is more pressing. Otherwise, according to the New Right (who in fact refused to call themselves “right”, the label which was given to their movement by their opponents), hegemony will be able to divide its opponents on artificial grounds and pose them against each other for the purpose of successfully dealing with everyone separately.

Denouncing Eurocentrism in Historical Sociology

The modern scholar of International Relations and one of the main representatives of historical sociology in International Relations, John Hobson, presents a completely different approach to this problem. In his key work, *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics* [xviii], Hobson analyzes nearly all of the approaches and paradigms of IR in terms of their hierarchies which are founded in principle on the comparisons of states, their roles, structures and interests to Western society as the universal referential standard. John Hobson concludes that all IR schools, without any exception, are based on an implicit Eurocentrism which recognizes the universality of Western societies and believes European history to be a phase compulsory for all other cultures. Hobson rightly considers this approach to be a form of European racism which gradually and imperceptibly passes from biological theories of the “superiority of the white race” to notions of the universality of Western cultural values, strategies, technologies, and interests. The “White Man’s Burden” becomes “the imperative of modernization and development.” At the same time, an indigenous society and culture are subjected to “modernization” by default – no-one asked whether they agree that Western values, technologies, and practices are universal or if they are an object of rejection. Only being faced with violent forms of desperate resistances in the forms of terrorism or fundamentalism does the West sometimes bring itself to ask the question: “Why do they hate us so much?” But the answer is a preconceived one: “The savagery and ingratitude of non-European peoples for all the blessings which Western “civilization” brings with it.”

Hobson importantly and convincingly shows that racism and Eurocentrism exist not only in the bourgeois theories of IR, but also in Marxism, including IR Critical Theory (neo- Gramscianism). The Marxists, despite their criticism of bourgeois civilization, remain convinced that its triumph is inevitable and thus share a common Eurocentrism in regards to Western culture. Hobson shows how Marx himself partly justified colonial practices insofar as they led to the modernization of the colonies and, thus, hastened the onset of proletarian revolutions. Thus, from historical perspective, Marxism is an accomplice of capitalist globalization and an ally of racist civilizational practices. Decolonization is regarded only as a prelude to the construction of the bourgeois state, which has yet to embark on full industrialization and move towards the future proletarian revolution. Very little separates this from the theories of the neo-liberals and trans-nationalists.

John Hobson thus proposes to begin to construct a radical alternative, a development of IR theory that is not based on Eurocentrism or racist approaches. He stands for the project of a “counter-hegemonic bloc” which, while being indeed nominated by neo-Gramscianism, would liberate itself from all forms of Eurocentrism and thus be qualitatively expanded.

The project of a non-Eurocentric theory of IR leads us directly to the Theory of the Multipolar World.

The Transition to Multipolarity

We can now bring together all of the above said on counter-hegemony and situate such in the context of the Theory of the Multipolar World (TMW) which is a theory of IR that is essentially, consistently non-Eurocentric, and which rejects hegemony on its own grounds and calls for the creation of a broad counter-hegemonic alliance or counter-hegemonic pact.

In TMW, counter-hegemony is understood in a similar way as neo-Gramscian theories and the Critical School of International Relations. Hegemony is the domination of capital and the bourgeois political system of society expressed in the intellectual sphere. In other words, hegemony is first and foremost a discourse. At the same time, the three segments of society designated by Gramsci, the base and the two components of the superstructure (politics and “civil society”) are considered by TMW to be predominant on the level of discourse, i.e., the intellectual sphere, in accordance with post-modern and post-positivist epistemology. Thus, questions of hegemony and counter-hegemony are central and fundamental to the construction of the TMW and its effective realization in practice. The sphere of metapolitics is just as important as politics and economics and does not eliminate them, but rather logically and conceptually precedes them. Man ultimately deals with his mind and its projections. Therefore, the arrangement or reorganization of consciousness automatically entails a change in the (internal and external) world.

The TMW is a fixation of the concept of counter-hegemony in the concrete theoretical field. Until a certain point, TMW strictly follows Gramscianism. But when it arrives at the expression of the content of a counter-hegemonic pact, there arise certain divergences. The most important of such involves the rejection of left dogmatism; the TMW refuses to consider the bourgeois transformation of modern societies to be a universal law, which thus brings the Gramscianism and metapolitics of the TMW closer to the “New Right” (Alain de Benoist’s) version than that of the “New Left” (of R. Cox), but without excluding Marxism to the extent that it is an ally in the common struggle against capital and hegemony. Strictly speaking, the term “right Gramscianism” is not entirely correct – it would be more correct to speak of an inclusive Gramscianism, i.e., in which counter-hegemony is widely understood as including all types of hegemonic confrontation and etymologically generalizing the otherwise rigid “counter”). This stands in contrast to exclusive Gramscianism (in which counter-hegemony is narrowly understood as “post-hegemony”). The TMW advocates inclusive Gramscianism. This position overcomes right and left and transcends the conceptual borders of the political ideologies of modernity, thus unfolding in the form of the Fourth Political Theory which is inextricably linked to the TMW.

J. Hobson's contribution to the development of inclusive counter-hegemony is extremely important in this regard. His call to build a non-Eurocentric IR theory precisely coincides with the purpose of the TMW. International relations should be interpreted from a plurality of positions just as the construction of any universal theory must take into account different cultures, civilizations, religions, ethnic groups, societies, and communities. Every society has its own values, anthropology, ethics, regulations, identity, and understanding of space and time, and the general and the particular. Every society has its own "universalism" or at the very least its own understanding of "the universal." What the West thinks about "universality" is well known, even too much so. It is time to give the rest of humanity the right to their own voices.

In its fundamental dimension, multipolarity means the free polylogue of societies, peoples, and cultures. But before this polylogue can actually appear, it is necessary to define general rules. Hence the a theory of International Relations, one which will involve an openness of terms, concepts, theories, notions, a plurality of actors, and the complexity and polysemy of expressions. In this case, TMW is not an end, but a beginning, the basic spatial preparation for the future world order.

However, the call for multipolarity is not sounded in empty space. Discourse on international relations and global political, social, and economic practice is dominated by hegemony. We live in a strictly Eurocentric world in which only one superpower (the USA) together with its allies and vassals (the NATO countries) are the imperialist dominants and in which market relations dictate all the rules of business practices, where bourgeois political norms are considered to be compulsory, where the technique and level of material development are considered to be the highest criteria, and in which the values of individualism, personal comfort, material well-being, and "freedom from" are extolled above all other factors. In other words, we live in a world of triumphant hegemony which has spread its network on a planetary scale and has subordinated all of mankind. Therefore, we need a radical opposition, struggle, and confrontation in order for multipolarity to be made real. In other words, we need a counter-hegemonic bloc (in the inclusive sense). We should now consider what resources this potential bloc has.

The Syntax of Hegemony and the Syntax of Counter-hegemony

In its conceptual hologram, hegemony is based on the belief that modernity excels over antiquity (the past), that modernity triumphs over pre-modernity, and that the West dominates the non-West (the East and the Third World).

Thus we have the structure of the syntax of hegemony in its most general form:

The West=Modernity=the goal=welfare= progress=universal values=the USA (+ NATO)=capitalism=human rights=market=liberal democracy=law

VS

The Rest= backwardness (pre-modernity)=the need for modernization (colonization/aid/lessons/external control)= the need for Westernization= barbarism (savagery)=native values=pseudo-capitalism (non-capitalism)=violation (less respect) of human rights=unfair market (State role, clans, group preferences)=pseudo-democracy=corruption

These formulas of hegemony are axiomatic and self-referencing, a kind of “self-fulfilling prophecy”. One term is justified by another one of the equivalent chain and is opposed to any term (symmetric or not) of the second chain. This unpretentious rule creates the discourse of hegemony. While it may have the appearance of causality, illustration, descriptiveness, analysis forecasting, historical research, opinion polling, debate, opposition, etc., in its structure, hegemony is in fact built on this backbone supported by millions of variations and disclosed experiences. If we accept these two parallel, equivalent chains, we find ourselves within hegemony and fully codified in its syntax. Any objection will be extinguished by new suggestive passes galloping through one or another term in order to arrive at hegemonic tautology. Even the most critical formulas of discourse sooner or later slip into these constantly repetitive semantic synonyms and dissolve. It is necessary to recognize at least one of these identifications, and then everything else is preordained. Hence why the creation of counter-hegemony begins with the retraction of both of these chains. Let us create the symmetrical syntax of counter-hegemony:

The West≠Modernity≠the goal≠welfare≠ progress≠universal values≠the USA (+ NATO) ≠capitalism≠human rights≠market≠liberal democracy≠law

VS

The Rest≠ backwardness (pre-modernity) ≠the need for modernization (colonization/aid/lessons/external control) ≠the need for Westernization≠ barbarism (savagery) ≠native values≠pseudo-capitalism (non-capitalism) ≠violation (less respect) of human rights≠unfair market (State role, clans, group preferences) ≠pseudo-democracy≠corruption

If the equal signs hypnotically enter the collective consciousness as something matter of fact, then the detailed justification of each equal sign requires a separate text or group of texts. To one degree or another, the TMW and its parallels in the forms of the Fourth Political Theory,[xviii], Eurasianism, the “New Right” (A. de Benoist), non-Eurocentric IR theory (J. Hobson), traditionalism, postmodernism, and so on fulfill this task in their own way, but what is important is presenting this schema as the most generalized form of counter-hegemonic syntax. The denying of a meaningful expression is in itself meaningful due to its negation of the fact, which means that each inequality is in fact imbued with meaning and connections. In questioning the chain of the identification of hegemony, we obtain a semantic field free of hegemony and its suggestive “axiomatism.” This completely unties our hands and allows us to deploy counter-hegemonic discourse.

In this case, we have retrieved such basic guidelines for a specific purpose: the preliminary and most generalized estimation of the resources that can be theoretically expected in the construction of a counter-hegemonic pact.

A Global Revolutionary Elite

The counter-hegemonic bloc is built by intellectuals. Therefore, at its core should be a global revolutionary elite which rejects the “status quo” at its deepest level. In trying to understand one’s position at any point of the modern world – in any country, culture, society, social class, professional function, etc. – man sooner or later arrives at an understanding of the basic theses of hegemonic discourse in searching for deep answers to the deep questions of the social arrangement in which he lives. Of course, this is not possible for everyone even though according to Gramsci every man is an intellectual in one way or another. However, the only real intellectual is he who represents man in a holistic sense, a kind of delegate to the parliament of thinking humanity (homo sapiens) on behalf of the more modest representatives (those who cannot or do not want to realize the fullness of man in the form of the possibility culminating in the opportunity to think, i.e., being an intellectual). We have such an intellectual in mind when we speak of identifying hegemony. At the point when he is faced with a choice, i.e., realizing his opportunity to become an intellectual, he can say “yes” to hegemony and accept its syntax, thus continuing to act within its structure, or he can say “no.” If he says “no”, he is sent on the quest for counter-hegemony; he searches for accession to the global revolutionary elite.

This search can stop at the intermediate stage. There are always local structures (traditionalists, fundamentalists, communists, anarchists, ethnocentrists, revolutionaries of different types, etc.) who, realizing the challenge of hegemony and rejecting it, operate at the local level. At this point we are

already dealing with the level of organic intellectuals who do not yet realize the need for culminating the rejection of hegemony in the form of a universal, planetary strategy. However, joining the real (not imaginary) fight against hegemony means that a revolutionary will sooner or later discover hegemony's transnational, extraterritorial nature. To realize its goals, hegemony always resorts to the combination of internal and external factors, attacking whatever it considers to be its enemy or an obstacle to its imperial domination (the elements of the second chain, "the rest"). Thus, the localized resistance to the global challenge at one point reaches its natural limits. Hegemony may retreat at one time only to come back. No one can ever merely dodge its attacks.

When such a realization is acquired, the most intellectually developed representatives of local counter-hegemony will feel the need to pass to the level of a fundamental alternative, i.e., mastering counter-hegemonic syntax. This is the direct path to the Global Revolutionary Alliance which will be objectively and quite naturally formed by the global counter-hegemonic elite, which is destined to become the core of counter-hegemony. Herein lies the necessity of the Theory of the Multipolar World.

[i] Dugin, A. The Theory of the Multipolar World, Moscow, 2012.

[ii] Before the end of the Cold War, Waltz took the example of the fight between the USA and the USSR as a fight between two hegemonies. Now, his adherents promote the idea that there will be a new bipolarity in which American hegemony will face China as the new candidate for the second pole.

[iii] "What we can do, for the moment, is to fix two major superstructural "levels": the one that can be called "civil society", that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called "private", and that of "political society" or "the State", said Gramsci. "These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of "hegemony" which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of "direct domination" or command exercised through the State and "juridical" government." Gramsci A. The Prison Notebooks vol. 1. Columbia University Press, 1992

[iv] Werner Sombart. Der Bourgeois. München und Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1913

[v] Hegel G. W. F., The Phenomenology of Spirit, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977

[vi] Gramsci A. The Prison Notebooks. Columbia University Press, 1992

[vii] Cox J. Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method// Millennium. 12.1983.

[viii] GUI. Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[ix] The Neo- Gramscian, Nicola Pratt defines counter-hegemony as the “a creation of an alternative hegemony on the terrain of civil society in preparation for political change”. Pratt N. Bringing politics back in: examining the link between globalization and democratization// Review of International Political Economy. Vol. 11. No. 2. 2004.

[x] Marx K., Engels F. Manifesto of the Communist Party. 1955.Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Манифест Коммунистической партии // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Сочинения. 2-е изд. Т. 4. М.: Государственное издательство политической литературы, 1955. С. 419-459.

[xi] Wallerstein I. After Liberalism. New York: New Press. 1995

[xii] Benoist deA. Vude droite. Anthologie critique des idees contemporaines. P., Copernic, 1977.

[xiii] Benoist deA. Europe, Tiers monde, tère combat. P.: Robert Laffont, 1986.

[xiv] Sombart, Werner (1915): Händler und Helden. München: Duncker & Humblot. 1915.

[xv] de Benoist A. Against Liberalism. To the Fourth Political Theory. S.-Petersburg, 2009

[xvi] Wallerstein I. After Liberalism. New York: New Press. 1995

[xvii] Hobson J. The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760-2010. Cambridge: Cambridge Umoniversity Press, 2012.

[xviii] Dugin A. The Fourth Political Theory. S.-Petersburg. 2009

Translator: Jafe Arnold

<https://eurasianist-archiv.com/2017/04/04/counter-hegemony-in-the-theor..>

Counter-hegemony in Theory of Multi-polar World

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Counter-hegemony in Theory of Multi-polar World

(English translation by N. Melentyeva)

Counter-hegemony is the major aspect of the Theory of Multi-polar World. It originally appeared in the context of the critical theory of International Relations (IR). This concept undergoes certain semantic transformations in the transition from the critical theory of International Relations to the Theory of Multi-polar World (TMW). Those transformations should be considered in more details. In this case, we need to recall the basic principles of the hegemony theory in the framework of the critical theory.

“Hegemony” conception in Realism

The hegemony concept in the critical theory is based on the Antonio Gramsci’s theory. The concept of hegemony in gramscizm and neogramscizm is different from its understanding in realistic and neorealistic trends of IR.

Classical realists use “hegemony” term in a relative way and understand it as the “factual and significant superiority in the potential power of any one state over the potential power of the other states, mostly neighboring”. The hegemony may be a regional phenomenon, for the conclusion if one or another political entity is hegemony, depends on the used scale of consideration. In this sense we can find this term in Thucydides, who spoke about the hegemony of Athens and the hegemony of Sparta during the Peloponnesian War. The classic realism uses this term in exactly the same way to present days. Such understanding of “hegemony” can be named “strategic” or “relative”.

Neorealism interprets “hegemony” in global (structural) context. The main difference from the classical realism here is that hegemony can’t be considered as the regional phenomenon, it is always global. According to K. Waltz’ neo-realism, for example, the balance of two hegemonies (bipolar world) is

confirmed to be an optimal balanced power structure in global scale². R. Gilpin believes that the hegemony can be combined with unipolarity, in other words there can exist one global hegemon (the U.S. performs this function today).

In both cases realists interpret "hegemony" as a way of correlation of world powers capacities.

Gramsci's understanding of hegemony is radically different and is placed in a completely diverse theoretical plane. To avoid incorrect use of the term in IR, and especially in TMW, we should dwell on Gramsci's political theory, in context of which the hegemony is in the priority considered in the critical theory and TMW. Furthermore, such a review could see more clearly a conceptual gap between critical theory and TMW.

Antonio Gramsci's conception of hegemony

Antonio Gramsci based his theory, later called "gramscizm", on the rethinking of Marxism and its practical appearance in history. As a Marxist, Antonio Gramsci is sure that socio-political history is completely determined by the economic factor. Like all Marxists, he explains the superstructure (Aufbau) through the basis (infrastructure, Basis). Bourgeois society is a quintessence of the class society, in which the exploiting process peaks in relation to the ownership of means of production and to the bourgeoisie appropriation of earned value, evolving from the production process. Inequality in the economic community (basis) and Capital's primacy over Labor are the essence of capitalism and define the entire social, political and cultural semantics (superstructure). All Marxists share this idea and there is nothing new or original in it. But Antonio Gramsci wonders how the proletarian socialist revolution was possible in Russia, where, according to Marx (who analyzed the situation in Russian Empire in XIX century in long term perspective) and to the classic European Marxism of the early XX century, the objective state of basis (poorly developed capitalist relations, the small percentage of the urban proletariat, the predominance of the agricultural sector in the total GDP, the absence of the bourgeois political system, etc.) precluded the very possibility of the assumption of power by the Communist party. However, Lenin made this possible and started building the socialism.

Gramsci interprets this phenomenon as fundamentally important, calling it "Leninism". Leninism in Gramsci's conception is vanguard, anticipatory capture of the political power by a resolute and consolidated superstructure (personified by the Bolshevik's Communist Party). As soon as the revolution becomes successful, the rush development of the basis is started through the accelerated construction of economic realities that have not been realized under capitalism yet: industrialization, modernization,

“electrification”, “public education”. Hence, under certain circumstances the politics (superstructure) can move ahead of the economy, concludes Gramsci. The Communist Party can be ahead of “natural” historical processes. Therefore, Leninism proves the existence of a considerable autonomy of the superstructure relatively to the basis.

But in Gramsci’s conception, Leninism is confined to the political segment of the superstructure, where the laws of power are in effect and the problem of the state is solved. Gramsci asserts that there is another important segment in the superstructure, which is not political in the strict sense of the word, i.e. not related to the party and associated directly with the political power problems. He calls it a “civil society”. This definition --“the civil Society in Gramsci’s conception” -- should be accompanied by an explanation, because the meaning he puts in this concept is rather different from its comprehending in liberal theories. According to Gramsci, the civil society is the area of intellectual activity in the broadest sense, minus the direct political (party, state, administrative) activity. The civil society is a zone for deployment of the intellectual parts of the society, including science, culture, philosophy, art, analytics, journalism, etc. For Gramsci as a marxist, this area, as the whole superstructure, by no means expresses the basis patterns. However, Leninism shows that even expressing the laws of basis, the superstructure in some cases can operate relatively autonomously, going ahead of the processes unfolded in the basis. The revolution experience in Russia in terms of history demonstrates how this process is realized in the political segment of the superstructure. And Gramsci puts forward a hypothesis here: if this is the case in the political segment of the superstructure, why something alike might not happen in the “civil society”? Gramsci’s conception of “hegemony”³ is born here. It aims to show that in the intellectual sphere (= the “civil society” by Gramsci) there exist something analogous to the economic differential (Capital vs. Labour) in the basis and to the political differential in the superstructure (bourgeois parties and government vs. proletarian parties and government – for example, in the Soviet Union). This third differential is the Gramsci’s “hegemony”, that is the set of domination strategies of the bourgeois consciousness over the proletarian consciousness under the conditions of relative autonomy with respect to both politics and economy. Another German sociologist Werner Sombart, exploring the bourgeois sociology⁴, had shown that the comfort could be valuable for both the Third Estate, which partly has it, and for other social groups, that do not know it and do not have it. Hegel’s “Phenomenology of spirit” likewise said that a Slave for the self-reflection does not use his own consciousness, but his Master’s one. Marx put this point of view into the basis of the Communist ideology. Following this chain of thoughts, Gramsci concludes that the adoption or rejection of hegemony (as the bourgeois consciousness structures) may directly depend neither on belonging to the bourgeois class (basis factor), nor on the direct political involvement in the bourgeois (or antibourgeois) party or administrative system. According to Gramsci, it is a matter of the free choice of an intellectual - to be with the hegemony or against it. When the intellectual consciously makes his choice, he moves from the “traditional” intellectual to the “organic” one that consciously chooses his position with respect to the hegemony. This implies an important conclusion: the intellectual can oppose the hegemony even in the society with the prevailing capitalist relations and bourgeois political domination. The intellectual can freely reject or accept the hegemony, because there is a gap of freedom, similar to

what exists in the politics with respect to the economy (as demonstrated by the experience of Bolshevism in Russia). In other words, you can be a bearer of the proletarian consciousness and stand on the side of the working class and fair society, being in the very heart of the bourgeois society. All depends on the intellectual choice: the hegemony is the matter of conscience.

Gramsci deduced his concept through the analysis of political processes in Italy of 1920s -30s. During this period, according to his analysis, conditions for socialist revolution had ripened in this country – in the basis (the developed industrial capitalism and intensification of class contradictions and class struggle), and in the

superstructure (the political success of the consolidated Left parties). However in those seemingly favorable conditions, the leftist forces failed because the hegemony represented by the dominant in the intellectual sphere in Italy, introducing bourgeois stereotypes and clichés even where it contradicted the economic and political realities and preferences of active anti-bourgeois groups. From Gramsci's point of view, Mussolini took advantage of that, turning the hegemony in his favor (according to the Communists, the fascism was a veiled form of the bourgeois domination) and artificially prevented the socialist revolution being brewed due to the natural historical course of events. In other words, participating in the relatively successful political battles, the Italian Communists, in Gramsci's opinion, lost from their sight the "civil society" and the sphere of intellectual "metapolitical" struggle, and that was the reason of their defeat. European Left (especially the New Left) adopted gramscism in this form, and put it into practice in Europe since 1960s. The Left (Marxist) intellectuals (Sartre, Camus, Aragon, Foucault, etc.) managed to implement anti-bourgeois concepts and theories in the very center of the social and cultural life, using publishing houses, newspapers, clubs and university departments, which were an integral part of the capitalist economy and acted in the political context of bourgeois system domination. Thus, they had prepared the events of 1968 that swept through Europe, and the left turn of European politics in 1970s. As well as Leninism proved in practice that the political segment of the superstructure has certain autonomy and the activity in the area can be ahead of the basis processes, gramscism in the New Left practice demonstrated the effectiveness and practical value of the active intellectual strategy.

Gramscism in critical theory: left bent

In the form described above gramscism was integrated in the critical theory of IR by its modern representatives – Robert Cox, Stephen Gill and others. They saved the continuity of the Marxist left discourse, despite the fact, they accentuated the autonomy of the "civil society" sphere and the hegemony phenomenon accordingly

by putting the intellectual choice above the political processes and economic structures, in the spirit of postmodern. For them, in general capitalism is better than pre-capitalist socio-economic systems, although it is clearly worse than the post-capitalist (socialist and communist) model coming to replace it. This explains the structure of the counter-hegemony⁹ project in the critical theory of IR. It remains in context of the left interpretation of the historical process. It can be described this way: according to the critical theory representatives, the hegemony (bourgeois society, culminating in the bourgeois consciousness hologram) must replace the sub-hegemony (society types prior to the bourgeois and its forms of collective consciousness – pre-modern). And after that, the hegemony will be ruined by the counter-hegemony, which is to set the post-hegemony after its victory. Marx and Engels insisted in “Communist Manifesto”¹⁰ that claims of Communists to the bourgeois have nothing to do with the claims of anti-bourgeois feudal, nationalist, Christian socialists, etc. to bourgeois. Capitalism is pure evil that absorbs relative (not so obvious and not so explicit) evil of older public exploitation forms. However to defeat it, we have to allow evil fully express itself first, and then totally eradicate it rather than retouch the most odious form of evil thus postponing the horizons of revolution and communism. It must be kept in mind when considering neo-gramscism structures of international relations.

This analysis divides countries into those where the hegemony strengthened explicitly (developed capitalist countries with the industrial economy, the domination of bourgeois parties in parliamentary democratic systems, organized in accordance with the examples of national states, which have developed the market economy and the liberal legal system) and those where that did not happen due to different historical circumstances. The first group called “developed democratic powers”, and the others are “borderline cases”, “problem areas” or even “rogue states”. Analysis of countries with the strengthened hegemony is fully integrated into general left analysis (Marxist, neo-Marxist and gramscism). However, the case of countries with “unfinished hegemony” should be considered separately. Gramsci himself called those countries “Caesarist” countries (the clear reference to the fascist Italy experience). “Caesarism” could be considered broadly, as any political system, where bourgeois relations exist in fragments and its political clearance (as classical bourgeois-democratic state) is delayed. In “Caesarism”, the authoritarian principle is not central. The main principle is to delay the full comprehensive installation of the western type capital system (in the basis and superstructure). The reasons of this delay may be different: the dictatorial government, elite clans, the presence of religious or ethnic groups in the government, cultural characteristics of the society, historical circumstances, specific economic condition or geographic location. It is important that in such a society the hegemony appears as both an external force (as part of bourgeois states and societies) and the internal opposition, connected with external factors one way or another.

Neo-Gramscists in IR claim that “Caesarism” constitutes the “sub-hegemony”, and its strategy to balance between the external and internal hegemony pressure, making some concessions, but at the same time,

making it selectively, aiming to keep power no matter what and prevent its capture by bourgeois political forces, expressing economic basis of society on the political superstructure level. Therefore, "Caesarism" is doomed to "Transformism" ("transformismo" itl.) - permanent adaptation to the hegemony, with the constant tendency to delay or send by a false path the final, to which it is moving steadily.

In this regard, representatives of the critical theory of IR consider "Caesarism" as a phenomenon to be eventually overcome by the hegemony, because it is nothing more than the "historical delay", and not an alternative or the "counter-hegemony".

Obviously, modern representatives of the critical theory of IR qualify most countries of Third World, and even major powers, members of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) as "Caesarism".

With such features, the counter-hegemony concept restriction in the critical theory becomes clear. Projects of the critical theory representatives are utopian. For example, Cox's "counter-society" is something inconspicuous and uncertain. They proceed from the dim project of the social and political world order that must come "after liberalism"¹¹ (Wallerstein) and meet communist utopia, which is familiar to

the Left. This version of hegemony is limited by the fact that it hastily puts many political events, which do not fall into the hegemony category but are similar to alternative versions of world order, into category of "Caesarism", and hence, "sub-hegemony", depriving them of any kind of interest for the effective counter-hegemonic strategy development. However, the general analysis of international relations structure, through the neo-gramscism methodology, is very important direction for the TMW development.

In order to overcome the critical theory limitations and release the full potential of neo-gramscism, we have to expand this approach qualitatively, going beyond the left (even "leftist") discourse, which puts the entire structure in the area of ideological sectarianism and marginal exotics (where it is located nowadays). In this issue, we will have the priceless assistance from the ideas of French philosopher Alain de Benoist.

Right Gramscism - the revision by Alain de Benoist

As far back as 1980s the French representative of the "new rights" («Nouvelle Droite») Alain de Benoist paid attention to Gramsci's ideas from the standpoint of their methodological potential. Benoist as well as Gramsci revealed the solidity of metapolitics as a special kind of intellectual activity, which prepares (in the form of "passive revolution") the future political and economic progress. The "new lefts" success in France and Europe generally proved efficiency of this method.

Unlike the majority of French intellectuals in the second half of XX, Alain de Benoist didn't support Marxism, which made his position rather isolated. At the same time A. de Benoist was building his political philosophy on radical rejection of liberal and bourgeois values, denying capitalism, individualism, modernism, geopolitical atlanticism and western eurocentrism. Furthermore, he opposed "Europe" and "West" as two antagonistic concepts: "Europe" for him is a field of deployment of a special cultural Logos, coming from the Greeks and actively interacting with the richness of Celtic, Germanic, Latin, Slavic, and other European traditions, and the "West" is the equivalent of the mechanistic, materialistic, rationalist civilization based on the predominance of the technology above everything. After O. Spengler Alain de Benoist understood "the West" as the "decline of the West" and, together with Friedrich Nietzsche and Martin Heidegger was convinced of the necessity of overcoming modernity as nihilism and "the abandonment of the world by Being(Sein)" (Seinsverlassenheit). West in this understanding was identical to liberalism, capitalism, and bourgeois society - all that "new right" claimed to overcome. "New right" at the same time agreed with the key meaning of the sphere of "civil society", given by Gramsci and his followers. So, Alain de Benoist came to the conclusion that the phenomenon named "hegemony" is a set of strategies, attitudes and values, which he himself considered an "absolute evil." This led to the proclamation of the principle of "the right gramscism".

"The right gramscism" means the recognition of the autonomy of "civil society in the meaning of Gramsci" with the identification of the phenomenon of hegemony in this area and the choice of its own ideological position on the opposite side of hegemony. Alain de Benoist publishes the program work "Europe, the Third World - the same battle", which is entirely built on the parallels between the Third world and Western bourgeois neo-colonialism struggle and the desire of European nations to free from bourgeois market society dictatorship, morals and practices of traders, which replaced the ethic of heroes (W. Sombart).

The major importance of "the right gramscism" for the TMW is that this understanding of "hegemony" can take a position beyond the left and Marxist discourse and reject the bourgeois order in the superstructure (politics and civil society) as well as in the basis (economics), but do it not after the time when hegemony becomes the total and global planetary fact but instead of it. This implies nuance in the

title of the other Benoists work "Against liberalism" unlike Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein's "After liberalism". As for Benoist it is impossible in any case to rely on the "after" and liberalism shouldn't be allowed to come true as a *fait accompli* -- we have to be against liberalism now, today, to fight it in any position and at any place in the world. The hegemony attacks on the planetary scale, finding its supporters both in the developed bourgeois societies and societies, where capitalism has not been finally established yet. Therefore the counter-hegemony has to be accepted beyond the sectarian ideological restrictions. If we want to create a counter-hegemonic bloc, we must include in its composition all the representatives of anti-bourgeois, anti-capitalist forces - left, right, or not amenable to any classification (de Benoist himself constantly emphasizes that the division between "left" and "right" is outdated and does not meet this chosen position; today much more important is if someone stands for the hegemony or against it).

Alain de Benoist's "Right gramscism" brings us back to the "Communist Manifesto" of Marx / Engels and regardless to their exclusivist and dogmatic call to "clean from fellow travelers" calls for the creation of the Global Revolutionary Alliance, which brings together all the enemies of capitalism and hegemony, all those who are essentially against it. At the same time it doesn't matter what is taken as a positive alternative - in this case, it is more important the presence of a common enemy. Otherwise, according to the "new rights" (which are refusing to call themselves the "right" - the name was given to them by their opponents), the hegemony will be able to divide its opponents on artificial grounds, to oppose them to each other in order to successfully defeat all of them separately.

The denunciation of Eurocentrism in historical sociology

John Hobson, a contemporary researcher of foreign affairs and one of the main representatives of historical sociology in IR, approached the same problem from an absolutely different side. In his program work «The Eurocentric Concept of World Politics» he analyses practically all approaches and paradigms in IR from the point of view of imbedded in them hierarchy, which is built on the principle of comparison of the governments, their roles, structure and interests with the examples of the Western society as a universal standard. J. Hobson comes to the conclusion that all schools of IR without any exceptions are built on the implicit Eurocentrism, admitting the universality of the West European societies and suggests that the phases of European history are compulsory for all other cultures.

Hobson fairly regards such approach as the manifestation of European racism, which gradually and imperceptibly goes from the biological theories of "the superiority of white race" to the concept of the universality of Western cultural values, strategies and technologies and then interests. "The burden of white man" becomes "an imperative of modernization and development". At the same time the local

societies and cultures are subject to this modernization by default – nobody asks them, if they agree that Western values, technologies and practices are universal, or they are ready to object something. Only when it collides with forcible forms of resistance in a form of terrorism and fundamentalism, the West asks itself (sometimes) : “Why do they hate us so much?” But the answer is there long before the question : “It happens because of the wildness and ingratitude of non-european nations for all that goods, which the Western “civilization” brings along”.

It is important that Hobson clearly shows that racism and eurocentrism are not inherent to the bourgeois theories of IR only, but also to Marxism, including critical theory of IR (neo-gramscianism). Marxists, with all their criticism of bourgeois civilization, are convinced that it's triumph is inevitable, and in that way they share europocentrism common to the Western culture. Hobson shows that Marx himself partly justifies colonial practices as they lead to the modernization of the colonies, and therefore they bring closer the moment of proletarian revolutions. Accordingly, in a historical perspective, marxism happens to be an accomplice of capitalist globalization and an ally of racist civilizational practices. From the Marxist point of view the decolonization is just a prelude to the construction of the bourgeois state, which is about to embark on a way of full industrialization and head towards the future of the proletarian revolution. And it does not differ much from the neo-liberals and the transnationalists.

John Hobson proposes to begin the creation of a radical alternative - the development of IR theory, based on non-eurocentrist and anti-racist approaches. He agrees with the project of "counter-hegemonic bloc", nominated by neo-gramscianists, but insists on a release from all forms of eurocentrism, and therefore on the quality of its expansion. The non-eurocentric IR theory project leads us directly to the TMW.

Moving to the Multi-polarity

Now we can bring together everything said about the counter-hegemony and put into the context of TMW being essentially and consistently non-eurocentric IR theory that denies the very basis of the hegemony and calls for the creation of a wide counter-hegemonic alliance or counter-hegemonic treaty.

Counter-hegemony of TMW is conceptualized in a similar way with the neogramscists' and representatives' of the critical school IR theories. The hegemony is the domination of capital and the bourgeois political system of the society, expressed in the intellectual sphere. In other words, hegemony is primarily a discourse. Moreover, among the three segments of the society distinguished by Gramsci -

the basis and the two components of the superstructure (the politics and "civil society") - TMW, in accordance with the postmodern and postpositivist epistemology, considers the level of discourse, i.e. intellectual sphere, to be the dominant. That is why the question of hegemony and counterhegemony seems to be the central and fundamental for the building of TMW and its effective implementation in practice. The area of meta-politics is more important than both politics and economy. It does not exclude them, but conceptually and logically precedes them. Ultimately, the human person has to deal only with his own mind and its projections. Therefore, the organization or reorganization of the consciousness automatically involves a change (internal and external) in the world.

TMW is the fixation of the counter-hegemonic concept in the specific theoretical area. And to a certain point TMW strictly follows the gramscism. But where we come to the substantive aspect of the counter-hegemonic pact, the significant differences appear. The most essential is the rejection of the left dogmatism: TMW refuses to consider the bourgeois transformation of modern societies on the whole planet as a universal law. So TMW accepts gramscism and meta-politics rather in the version of "new right" (Alain de Benoist) than in the version of the "new left" (R. Cox). The position of Alain de Benoist is not exclusivist and does not exclude Marxism to the extent it is an ally in the common struggle against Capital and hegemony. Therefore, strictly speaking, the term "right gramscism" is not quite correct: it would be better to speak of an inclusive gramscism (counter-hegemony, understood broadly as all types of opposition to hegemony, i.e. as a generalizing and etymologically strict "counter -") and of an exclusive gramscism (counter-hegemony in the narrow sense, just as the "post-hegemony"). The TMW goes for the inclusive gramscism. To be more exact it is the position of overcoming the rights and the lefts, beyond the conceptual limits of the Modern political ideology, that reveals in the context of the Fourth Political Theory, closely connected with TMW.

J. Hobson's contribution in the development of the inclusive counter-hegemony is extremely important. His call to build non euro-centric theory of IR precisely matches the TMW goal. IR should be thought of from plural positions. While building up a real versatile theory all the representatives of different cultures and civilizations, religions and ethnoeses, societies and communities must be listened to and taken into consideration. Each society has its own values, its own anthropology, ethics, its own standards, identity, and its own ideas about space and time, about the general and particular. Each society has its own « universalism » - or at least its own understanding of what is called "universalism". We know pretty well what the West thinks about universalism. It is time to let the rest mankind speak.

That is what we call multi polarity in its fundamental dimension: a free polylogue of societies, peoples, and cultures. But before such polylogue is able to be started it is necessary to define the general rules. And this is the theory of International Relations, which supposes the openness of terms, concepts, theories, notions, the plurality of factors, the complexity and polisemanticism of statements. Not

tolerance but the cooperation and mutual understanding. In this case the TMW is not the end but the start, the beginning, the clearing of the basic space for the future world order.

However, the call to multipolarity does not sound in the empty space. The hegemony dominates in the discourse about international relations, in the global political, social, and economic practice. We live in the rigid eurocentric world, where one superpower (the U.S.) dominates imperialistically with its allies and vassals (NATO); where the trade relations dictate all the rules of business practices; where the bourgeois political norms are taken as the mandatory ones; where the technology and the degree of material development is considered to be the highest criteria; where the values of individualism, personal comfort, material well-being, and "freedom of" are exalted above all others. In short, we live in the world of the triumphant hegemony, which spreads its cobweb through the entire planet and subordinates the whole mankind. So to create the reality of the multi-polarity it's necessary to have a radical opposition, struggle, confrontation. In other words, it's necessary to have the counter-hegemonic block (in its inclusive sense).

Let's see, what resources are available to this potential block?

The syntax of hegemon /syntax of counter-hegemony

The hegemony in its conceptual hologram is based on the conviction that the modernity excels the antiquity (the past) in everything, Modernity triumphs over the Premodern, and the West excels the non-West (East, the Third World) in everything.

Here is the structure of the syntax of hegemony in its most general form:

West (the West) = Modernity (Modern) = target = benefit = progress = universal values = U.S. (NATO +) = capitalism = the human rights = market = liberal democracy = justice

versus

The rest (the Rest) = retardation (pre-modern) = in need of modernization
(colonization/help/tutoring/external control) = in need of Westernization = barbarism (wildness) = local
valuables= fore-capitalism (not yet capitalism) = (lack of respect for) human rights failure = unfair market
(participation of State, clans, group preferences) = fore-Democracy = Corruption.

Those formulas of the hegemony are axiomatic and self-referencing, as a kind of «self-fulfilling prophecy". One term is justified by another from the chain of equivalences and set opposed to any term (whether symmetric or not) of the second chain. According to these unpretentious rules any hegemony discourse is being built. It may seem reasonable, illustrative, descriptive, analytical, forecasting, historically researching, socially surveying, debating, oppositional, etc. But in its structure the hegemony is built on this very skeleton covered by millions of variations and told tales.

If we accept those two parallel sets of equations, we find ourselves inside the hegemony and are fully encoded by its syntax. Any objection will be suppressed by new suggestive passes, by galloping through one or another term to find and reach a desired hegemonic tautology.

Even the most critical forms of discourse eventually slips into this constantly renewable route of semantic synonyms and dissolve in it. Once you recognize just one of the patterns, everything is preordained. Therefore, the construction of counter-hegemony starts with the complete contradiction to those both chains.

Let's construct the symmetric syntax of counter-hegemony:

West ≠ present (Modern)≠ goal ≠ wealth ≠ progress ≠ universal values ≠ U.S.A. ≠ capitalism ≠human
rights ≠ market ≠ liberal democracy ≠ justice

versus

Rest ≠ backwardness ≠ needs modernization(colonization/ help/ lesson/ external management) ≠
needs westernization≠ barbarity (wildness) ≠ local values≠ not capitalism ≠ non-observance ≠ human
rights ≠ unfair market (participation of State, clans, group preferences) ≠ fore-democracy≠ corruption

If equality signs are being hypnotically inserted into the collective consciousness as something self-evident, the developed justification of every inequality sign demands a separate text or group of texts. To some extent the TMM and The Fourth Political Theory, eurasianism, « the new rights» (A.De Benoist), non-eurocentric IR theory (J. Hobson), traditionalism, postmodernism etc., perform this task parallel to it, but now it is important to offer this scheme as the most general form of the counter-hegemonic syntax. Denial of the substantial statement is substantial due to the mere fact of the denial, so the justification of inequalities is already loaded by meanings and connections. By questioning the hegemony identification chains, we receive a semantic field, free from hegemony and its suggestive "axiomatics". Just this one completely unties our hands to deploy the counter-hegemonic discourse.

In this case we provided those basic rules for a specific goal: we need to make a preliminary and most general enumeration of the resources that might be counted on in the creation of the counterhegemonic pact.

Global revolutionary elite

The counterhegemonic block is built around intellectuals. Therefore, the core of it should be the global revolutionary elite rejecting "the status quo" in its most deep basis. This global revolutionary elite is formed around the syntax of counter-hegemony. Trying to comprehend the situation from any point of the modern world, – in any country, culture, society, social class, professional function, etc., - the person in search of deep answers about the organization of the society in which he lives will come sooner or later to the understanding of basic theses of the hegemonic discourse. Certainly, it is not given to everyone though, according to Gramsci, everyone is an intellectual to some extent. But only the full-fledged intellectual represents the human person in the full and perfect sense; he is a sort of a delegate into the parliament of intellectual mankind (homo sapiens) from the more modest representatives of it (from those who can't or doesn't want to realize fully the abilities and opportunities given to the human species culminating in the ability to think, that is to be an intellectual). When we speak about the hegemony, we keep in mind such an intellectual. At this moment he comes to a choice, i.e. he realizes the opportunity to become "the organic intellectual": he can tell "yes" to the hegemony and accept its syntax working further in its structure, and he can tell "no". When he says "no", he goes to look for a counter-hegemony, i.e. seeks access to the global revolutionary elite.

This search can stop at the intermediate stage: there always exist local structures (traditionalists, fundamentalists, communists, anarchists, ethnocentrists, revolutionaries of different types, etc.) which are aware of the hegemony challenge and reject it, but at the local level. Here we are already at the level of organic intellectuals but not yet realizing the need to summarize their reject of hegemony in the

form of the universal planetary strategy. However, entering the real (not imaginary) fight with the hegemony, any revolutionary sooner or later discovers its transnational, extraterritorial character: the hegemony always resorts to a combination of internal and external factors for its own purposes; it attacks what it considers its opponent or an obstacle to its imperial domination (the elements of the second chain – the other (the Rest). Therefore the local resistance to a global challenge at some moment reaches its natural limits; sometime the hegemony can recede, but it will come again, and nobody is able to ever evade it.

At the moment of this awareness the most intellectually developed representatives of the local counter-hegemony feel the need to go to the level of the fundamental alternative, i.e. to the mastering of the counter-hegemonic syntax. And this is a direct path to the Global Revolutionary Alliance. In that way the world counter-hegemonic elite is going to be shaped up objectively and naturally. It is the fate of this elite to become a kernel of the counter-hegemony. Most of all the TMM is needed by it.

Counter-hegemony's resources: "revisionists" of the world order and their levels

Classic MO theories, particularly, realism divide countries into those who are satisfied with the present situation and with the balance of powers in the world order, and those who are not satisfied with it and who would like to change it to their advantage.

The first are named "the status quo apologists", the second are called "the revisionists". The forces of the world regardless of their size and influence which entered the hegemony and are satisfied with it represent one half of the thinking human beings, the revisionists – the second one. Naturally the counter-hegemonic elite considers the totality of "revisionists" as its resource. It is the "revisionists" whether they realize it themselves or not, who need the TMM. The need in TMM can be quite unconscious, but even though we assume the model of "Caesarism" and suggest that many political figures are occupied exclusively with the "transformism" processes (transformismo), the TMM gives them an additional argument to oppose the pressure of the hegemony. In other words, the counter-hegemonic elite (in the broad sense, in the structured way described above- on the other side of the right and left) has the powerful natural resource represented by "the revisionists".

In order for this resource to be available it is absolutely not necessary for the governing political elite of the "revisionist" countries to be in any agreement with the counter-hegemony or to accept the TMM as a guide to the foreign policy. And now it's time to remember the significance of the intellectual discourse in its autonomous state (what the neo-gramschism insists on). It is sufficient that the Global

Revolutionary Alliance intellectuals will be aware of the meaning and functions of "Caesarist" regimes in the global field of hegemony; "the revisionists" themselves act intuitively, while the representatives of the counter-hegemony pact - fairly consciously. The medium-term interests of both coincide. And it makes the counter-hegemony pact the fundamental force: the hardware is provided by the "revisionists", the software - by the global revolutionary elite.

The "revisionists" of the modern world make a whole number of powerful and advanced nation-states, which due to the different historical circumstances are placed by the global hegemony into such an environment that they feel themselves deprived, at a disadvantage. Their further development according to the logic imposed by the global discourse will inevitably lead them either to undesirable consequences for the current political elites or to the further deterioration of the situation in these countries. The "revisionists" are very different: some are inclined to trade off with the hegemony, while others are trying every way to evade its influence. However, the field for the global revolutionary elite activities is everywhere.

The most serious union of the "revisionist" countries is the BRICS. Each of these countries is a huge resource all by itself, and the management of "Second World" club is objectively interested in multipolarity - hence, there is nothing to prevent the advance of the TMM as their strategic foreign policy program.

The whole constellations of major regional powers gravitate around the countries of the "Second World", namely, Argentina, Mexico - in the Latin America; Turkey, Pakistan - in Central and Southwest Asia; Saudi Arabia, Egypt - in the Arab world, Vietnam, Indonesia, Malaysia, South Korea - in the Far East, etc. Each of those countries could also be attributed to the "revisionists" to some extent and has an impressive list of regional ambitions difficult or impossible to meet in the hegemony system. Those countries have even more fears and challenges in their security, and the hegemony does not facilitate any protection of that. In addition, there is a whole number of countries in the direct opposition to the hegemony (Iran, North Korea, Serbia, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, and so on), which provides the Global Revolutionary Alliance with the preferred strategic sites.

At the next sub-state level a more detailed analysis is needed to identify the "revisionists" at the political level, i.e. the political parties and movements, which, for ideological reasons or otherwise reject the hegemonic discourse in some essential element. Such political forces can be right or left, religious or secular, nationalist or cosmopolitan, parliamentary or considerably oppositional, mass or "Clara's party". All of them can be integrated into the counter-hegemonic elite strategy. At the same time such parties and movements can be located both in the political zone of the "revisionists" and in the field of the

countries where the hegemony has established itself firmly and thoroughly. Under certain circumstances, especially in the conditions of crisis or reforms – certain windows of opportunity for non-conformed forces and their (relative) success and advance are opened even within such powers.

In the civil society segment the counter-hegemony opportunities are even wider as the carriers of the hegemonic discourse act here directly, without masks and mediations. In the field of science, culture, arts, and philosophy the counter-hegemony carriers that mastered the syntax are capable to resist effectively to ideological opponents, as the quantity and weight in this environment is of very minor importance. One talented and prepared intellectual from the counter-hegemony may be worth thousands of opponents. In the non-political sphere of sciences, culture, art, and philosophy the counter-hegemony can use the huge arsenal of means and methods counting from the religious and traditionalist to vanguard and post-modernist. Being guided by the correctly understood counter-hegemonic syntax, the deployment of various intellectual strategies challenging the western "axiomatic" of the Modernist style is going to be as easy as pie. This model can be also easily applied not only in non-western societies, but also in the developed capitalist countries, repeating in the new historical situation the successful experience of the new "left gramscism" in Europe of the 60-70th years of the XX century.

The set of the sub-state political structures and the borderless zone of the "civil society" (in Gramsci's understanding) gives us the meso-level whereas the "revisionist" States themselves can be taken for the macro-level for the counter-hegemonic practice of expansion.

And at last, the micro-level that is the separate individuals who also can be under certain conditions the counter-hegemony carriers as the field of fight for the TMM is the person itself in all his measurements – from personal to social and political. The globality should be understood anthropologically.

Thus we receive the huge reservoir of resources which is at the disposal of the potential global revolutionary elite. In the situation when the rules are set by the hegemony, and "fore-hegemony" or merely "non-hegemony" passively resists it, this resource is either neutralized, or involved in an infinitesimal degree in strictly local situations, i.e. it is not consolidated, scattered and is exposed to the gradual entropy. For the hegemony itself in this case it is no more than a passive obstacle, inertia, and the subject to be conquered, "domesticated" or dismantled (thus for construction of the road they cut down the forest or fill up the swamp). But all this becomes the counter-hegemony resource when the counter-hegemony becomes the self-conscious force, the historical subject, the phenomenon. All this is transformed into a resource when we have the global revolutionary elite turned to TMM as to its theoretical base. Prior to it and without it all listed moments are not a resource.

Counterhegemony and Russia

We still have to project the principles of counterhegemony in the TMW context in the situation in Russia.

In a context of the "neo-gramscist" analysis the modern Russia represents the classic "Caesarism" with all its typical attributes. The hegemony, for its part, solidly places Russia in the "Other" (theRest) chain and builds its image in the compliance with the classical syntax: "authoritarianism"="corruption"="needs modernization"="does not observe human rights and freedom of the press"="the State interferes with business issues", etc.

Subjectively the Russian management is occupied by the processes of "transformism" (transformismo), constantly balancing between concessions to the hegemony (participation in the international economic organizations, such as the WTO, privatization, the market, democratization of the political system, fine tuning to the educational standards of the West, etc.) and the urge to preserve the sovereignty and at the same time the ruling elite power leaning on the "patriotic" mass moods. At the same time in the international relations Putin personally unambiguously adheres to realism whereas the Government and expert community obviously gravitates to the liberalism that creates a doublethink[^] typical for "transformismo".

For the TMM and counter-hegemonic elite such situation creates the favorable environment for the expansion of autonomous activity and represents the natural enclave promoting its development, strengthening and consolidation. Russia is unambiguously related to the camp of "revisionists" in the international system, having lost the position of one of the two super-states in the 90th years of the XX century and having sharply reduced the sphere of its influence even at the close borders. Unipolarity of the world order and strengthening of the hegemony in the last decades (=globalization) brought to Russia exclusively negative results, because they were built – geopolitically, strategically, ideologically, politically and "psychologically" – at her expense. And although the preconditions for an active revenge are obviously not riped yet, the general atmosphere and the main objective tendencies help to establish the TMM and promote the strengthening and crystallization of the Russian segment of global counter-hegemonic revolutionary elite. Moreover, many steps by V.V.Putin in the foreign policy issues directed to the strengthening of the Russian sovereignty, his intentions in the construction of the Euro-Asian Union, his critic of the unipolar world and the American domination, and also incidental notes of the multi-polarity as the most desirable world order – all this expands the field of opportunity for the organic creation of the full and well-founded theory of the counter-hegemony in the TMW context.

Notes

1. Dugin A. G. Theory of Multi-polar World. M., Eurasian Stir, 2012.
2. Waltz took confrontation between the U.S. and Soviet Union as an example of two hegemonies until the end of "cold war". Currently, he is inclined to the idea of new bipolarity, where China is counterweight to American Hegemony.
3. "You can fix tow huge superstructure plans: one, which can be called "civil society", that is constellation of organisms commonly called "private", and other, that is "political society", or the state. They correspond to "hegemony" function which dominant group performs throughout society and "direct domination" function, which expressed in the state, in the "legal government" – wrote Gramsci. Gramsci A. Prison Books. Part 1. – M. Publishing house of Political Literature, 1991.
4. Zombart Verner. Bourgeois, M. "Nauka", 1994.
5. Hegel F. G. Phenomenology of spirit. St. Petersburg. "Nauka", 1992
6. Gramsci A. Prison Books.
7. Cox R. Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method// Millennium 12, 1983.
8. Gill S. Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
9. Neo-gramscist Nichols Pratt defines counter-hegemony as "creating alternative hegemony in area of civil society for preparation of policy change". Pratt. N. Bringing politics back in: examining the link between globalization and democratization// Review of International Political Economy. Vol. 11, No. 2, 2004.

10. Marx K., Engels G. Communist Manifesto / Marx K., Engels G. Essays – 2nd ed. – T. 4. –M.: State publishing house of Political Literature. 1955. P. 419-459.

11. Wallerstein I. After liberalism. – Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2003.

4pt

COUNTER-INITIATION: CRITICAL REMARKS ON SOME ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE OF RENÉ GUÉNON

[Twitter](#) [VK](#) [Odnoklassniki](#) [Blogger](#) [LiveJournal](#) [Email](#) [Print](#) [Share](#)

RELIGION

18.06.2019

Alexander Dugin

Translated by Eurasianist Internet Archive

Originally published in the journal *Mily Angel* #3 – *Konets Sveta* ('Sweet Angel: The End of the World', Moscow: Arktogetia, 1998). Subsequently republished as an appendix to the second edition of the book *Puti Absoliuta* ("The Ways of the Absolute") in the *Absoliutnaia Rodina* trilogy ("Absolute Homeland", Moscow: Arktogetia, 1999).

Preliminary remarks: the necessity of correcting Traditionalism

The question of "counter-initiation" is the most shrouded and ambiguous in all of Traditionalist thought. Perhaps this is a consequence of the very reality which Traditionalists, following Guénon, denote with the term "counter-initiation."

The meaning of counter-initiation is set out by René Guénon in his book *The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times*. In brief, we can say that Guénon understands counter-initiation to be the sum of secret organizations which, although in possession of initiatic and esoteric data, nonetheless direct their activities and efforts towards a goal which is the direct opposite of normal initiation. In other words, instead of striving towards the absolute, they head towards fatal disappearance and dissolution amidst the "reign of quantity" in its external twilight. In line with Islamic esotericism, Guénon called the hierarchs of counter-initiation *Awliya es-Shaytan*, that is to say the "saints of Satan." In Guénon's point of view, representatives of counter-initiation stand behind all the negative tendencies of modern civilization and are secretly administering the course of affairs down the path of degradation, materialization, and spiritual perversion.

According to Tradition, the logic of the cyclical process inevitably boils down to a trajectory of degradation, from the Golden Age to the Iron Age. As follows, there should be various conscious forces contributing to this process just as, conversely, the forces of true initiation and genuine esotericism try to impede this fatal decline by all means. This historical dualism of Guénon's in no way affects the metaphysical unity of the Principle, insofar as it belongs to the sphere of manifestation, where the main law is that of duality. This duality at the very heart of manifestation is overcome only upon going beyond the manifest into the sphere of the transcendental. We cannot discard the dualism within the world. Thus, the role of counter-initiation is partly justified insofar as it is rooted not in arbitrariness, but in the very providential necessity tied to the laws of the universe.

This purely theoretical aspect of the doctrine of counter-initiation is completely flawless from a logical point of view and is confirmed by all the various doctrines of sacred traditions dealing with “demons”, “the devil”, “evil spirits”, the “Antichrist”, etc. But everything becomes much more complicated when we attempt to move from theory to practice and name specific organizations or secret societies as examples of counter-initiation. This is only part of the problem. Before we can clarify this subtle question, it is necessary to attentively examine what René Guénon meant by “initiation” and “esotericism.”

According to Guénon, the historical variance of sacred forms – religions, traditions, etc. – is a consequence of the differing qualities of the human and historical environments into which the rays of the One Non-Human Truth are projected. In other words, for Guénon, all traditions, as one approaches their center, transcend confessional differences and almost always merge into something unified. Guénon called this the “Primordial Tradition” (la Tradition Primordiale). It is this Tradition, according to Guénon, that constitutes the secret essence of all religions. In a certain sense, this is true. Any careful study of the symbolism of Tradition, its rituals and doctrines, leads one to the idea that all sacred teachings have some kind of common element or paradigm which is somewhat lost sight of when one arrives at more narrow dogmatic aspects and matters of detail. The thesis of the “unity of Tradition” is particularly convincing in current circumstances, as the modern world has built a civilization whose basis strikingly contrasts everything that might be called Tradition(al). In other words, Integral Traditionalism and the appeal to the One Tradition are reliable to the extent to that they contrast the modern world to all those civilizational forms that are founded on sacred elements. Indeed, there are many more similarities than differences between the various traditions and religions when compared to the contrasting backdrop of modern, completely de-sacralized civilization. This postulate is obvious. The

question is: to what extent is this convergence in the face of a common enemy a consequence of esoteric unity?

In other words, is the difference between the most sacred traditions merely the result of faults in the cosmic environment at certain moments in the cycle? Are there not some deeper reasons behind this?

One glaring example of the relevance of such doubt can be seen in Guénon's hesitation as to whether Buddhism should be counted an authentic tradition or not. Guénon initially relegated Buddhism to the category of antinomian heresies, but later recognized it to be a genuine tradition. The question at hand is not even that of Buddhism, but the fact that Guénon's very own uncertainty exhibits a certain conditionality of his method whenever the matter at hand concerns concrete historical traditions and their dogmatic principles. If even Guénon could be mistaken on the question of Buddhism – which remained for him largely an abstraction, for the analysis of which Guénon relied on the opinions of his Hindu informants who, like all Hindu Traditionalists, are distinguished by their acutely anti-Buddhist orientations – then it cannot be excluded that such errors may occur in the case of other religions as well.

Our own studies have led us to the conclusion that Guénon was not quite right in his analysis in two other cases. Firstly, when Guénon denied the Christian Church an initiatic dimension – and he dated the loss of this dimension, present in early Christianity, to the era of the first Ecumenical Councils – he was clearly relying exclusively on the history and historiosophy of the Catholic branch (with the later deviation of Protestantism). Guénon clearly ignored the metaphysical and initiatic reality of Orthodoxy, which differs from Western Christianity sharply and on the most fundamental positions. Guénon equated Christianity with Catholicism and inappropriately projected the proportions of the Catholic organization, including the mystical nature of its rituals and theological specifics, onto Christianity as a whole. This rendered his views on the matter completely incorrect. [1]

Secondly, Guénon was quick to recognize Jewish Kabbalah to bear the quality of genuine esotericism which, in his opinion, is distinguished by universalism and is beyond any particularisms. But in fact, Kabbalah insists on the ethnic specialness of Jews, the uniqueness of their fate, and their metaphysical opposition to all other peoples and religions no less (if not more) than the Talmud and exoteric Judaism. This clearly contradicts Guénon's definition of esotericism, according to which principles of universal unity and the merging of all spiritual and religious forms into a common concept should predominate.

Even in its most transcendental aspects, Kabbalah affirms not unity, but a radical and indelible metaphysical-ethnic dualism.

Moreover, on a more general plane, Guénon's assessments of certain peoples – such as the Ancient Greeks, the Japanese, the Germans, Anglo-Saxons, and Slavs – were at times so subjective and arbitrary that Guénon's striving to base some of his conclusions as to the orthodoxy or non-orthodoxy of various traditional forms on these appraisals calls into question everything in Traditionalism related to the application of theoretical considerations to the practical sphere.

The absence of universal counter-initiation

The differences between religious forms can constitute far more of a profound factor than the conditions of exotericism, and can be rooted in metaphysics itself. If, by virtue of the specificity of their traditions, synthesis can be accomplished rather easily with Hinduism and Islamic esotericism (while all other traditions are interpreted in terms exclusively peculiar to them), then the matter stands somewhat differently with other religions. Hinduism and Islam allowed Guénon to construct a logical and non-contradictory picture, but one which becomes less apparent when we try to apply it to different religions and their specific approaches to metaphysics.

For Guénon and the Traditionalists who follow him, the situation is thus: the One Metaphysical Tradition, which constitutes the essence of universal esotericism, is the inner kernel of all orthodox traditions. Dogmatic religions and other forms of exoteric traditions are external shells covering in diverse ways this unity of content (esotericism and initiation). On the pole opposite of universal esotericism is “counter-initiation”, which entails not simply the rejection of this or that religious or exoteric form, but universalism itself. Thus, the very notion of “counter- initiation” is inseparable from the postulation of the esoteric unity of all traditions.

However, outside of esoteric Islamic and Hindu contexts, such logic cannot be accepted unequivocally, as the metaphysics of other traditions do not recognize any esoteric solidarity with other religious forms. In fact, the universalism of Sufism and Hinduism is not so obvious as it may seem at first glance. The price of recognizing the orthodoxy of other religious forms is affirming that they are “distorted”, and treating their dogma in the spirit and letter of the specific esotericism peculiar to Hinduism and Sufism.

For example, the Hindu approach to Christology practically equates Christ with an avatar, which, in a purely Christian dogmatic framework, is equivalent to the “monophysite” view. Islam, on the contrary, proceeding from a strict monotheism, adheres to a “Nestorian” (“Arian”) Christological scheme. In both cases, the Orthodox Christian formula which ultimately leads to its own, altogether different metaphysical perspective is denied [2]. Thus, the universalism proclaimed by Traditionalists turns out to be not so total and unambiguous as one would like.

Furthermore, Hinduism bases its tradition on a formula that is inverse to that of the Iranian tradition, despite deriving from the same source. As is well known, even in the very names for gods and demons, there is an inverse analogy between Zoroastrianism and Hinduism. Moreover, Hinduism considers Buddhism to be a heterodoxy (a view to which Guénon himself adhered for quite a long time). As follows, these three Eastern Indo-European traditions cannot reach agreement with one another and seamlessly establish esoteric unity. Indeed, it is quite difficult to recognize any “esoteric rightness” on the part of those who call one’s gods “demons” and vice versa (the Devas and Asura in Hinduism and Zoroastrianism are of directly contradictory elements), or who radically deny the authority of the main sacred source (as Buddhists reject the Vedas, castes, and all the foundational doctrines of Hinduism).

The situation is even more severe in the Abrahamic context. If Islam recognizes some kind of legitimacy among the traditions of the “peoples of the Book” (Judaism and Christianity) and believes Muhammad’s mission to be the last word of “Abrahamism” which corrected all previous errors, then neither Christians nor Jews recognize even the slightest authenticity of other versions of Abrahamism, which are considered heresies, lies, and evil.[3] The example of the Zohar, the highest authority of Kabbalah, easily lends towards the conviction that hostility towards Islam and Christianity is not only the case on the metaphysical and esoteric level, but here it attains the highest metaphysical tension. Accordingly, Orthodox esotericism relates to Judaism (both exoteric and esoteric) just as harshly, seeing it not only as an Otherness of external religious form, but as the embodiment of metaphysical evil and the “tradition” of the Antichrist.

Thus, beyond Sufism and Hinduism (whose universalism is also not unlimited), there is no common esotericism. This means that traditions understand “counter-initiation” to be those sacred forms which openly contradict their own metaphysics. If the exoteric evil in this case is represented by the negative points stemming from the ethical-dogmatic specifics of a given religion, then the esoteric evil (counter-initiation) would be the metaphysics of a tradition that contradicts such. All of this incredibly complicates the question of counter-initiation, which ceases to be so obvious and transparent, and in fact becomes extremely confusing.

From the point of view of Orthodox esotericism, Judaism and Kabbalah are undoubtedly counter-initiatic.[4] From the Zohar's point of view, the esotericism of the Goyim, especially the "descendants of Ishmael and Esau" (Muslims and Christians), is "the false teaching of the demon Samael" who "leaps on the serpent Lilith." From the point of view of Hindu esotericism, Iranian dualism is rooted in the fact that Zoroastrians worship demons, the Asura, (Iranian Ahura), whom they (Hindus) call "gods." Buddhist esotericists, meanwhile, are convinced that the initiatic doctrines of Hinduism are the ultimate evil, insofar as they only increase the attachment of beings to Samsara – after all, the higher divine worlds are distinguished in the Buddhist perspective by an even greater illusory quality than the worlds of humans, as the absence of suffering only alienates the prospect of achieving Nirvana. In Islamic civilization, the most radical representatives of manifestationist esotericism – such as al-Hallaj, Suhrawardi, etc. – were executed as malicious heretics.

How, in such a situation, can one discern any universal counter-initiation, trace its origins, and recognize the forces and organizations serving as its cover? If the universality of esotericism (in the very least, in our cyclical situation) is not obvious and proven, then how can we speak of any universality of "counter-initiation" being the inverse projection of such?

Inter- and intra-religious contradictions

On the one hand, there exist deep contradictions between traditional religious systems which pertain to the higher realms of metaphysics. On the other hand, these traditional forms are not immutable, but are subject to cyclical laws. Traditions pass through difficult periods of historical embodiment, among which, besides the natural stages of rise and fall, there exist even more paradoxical moments entailing the amendment of internal nature, alienation, and transformation into something essentially different while maintaining external attributes.

More often than not, these disturbing moments cannot be reduced to some "triumph of negative tendencies" as seen by the exoteric tradition and morality derived from the letter of sacred forms. For example, the Islamic tradition can degenerate without its authorities publicly denying the principle of monotheism or the mission of Muhammad, and Christians by no means need to worship other gods (or Satan) in order to break with the source and spirit of the Church. If everything were so simple, history would be an elementary, mechanical device with predictable functioning and an easily foreseen future. In fact, this is how many things are seen by those people distinguished by a naive (if not to say idiotic)

view of the world, no matter whether they are “conservatives” or “progressives.” Only a deep understanding of the internal kernel of tradition, the real realization of its higher levels, allows us to isolate and grasp what is foremost and most essential, and that means accurately discriminating between the true axis of orthodoxy and alienation, deviation, simulation, and degeneration. There are no purely external criteria to this question. One should not overestimate the “devil” – if he were as simple as moralists think, he would hardly have been able to participate in human history so actively, for so long, and, most importantly, so unrecognizably.

For example, the schism of the Christian world into the Eastern and Western Churches was far from a purely exoteric event. Behind the schism lurk the most profound metaphysical reasons. The same is true for the Islamic world and the division into Shiites and Sunnis. The Sunni tradition (especially Wahhabism) believes in the high authority of Sultan Yazid, who killed Ali, i.e., Muhammad’s cousin who is the spiritual pole (qutb) for Shiites, the first Imam. Behind this contradiction lie much deeper discrepancies of a purely metaphysical nature. [5]

In a certain sense, things are no smoother in the case of Hinduism, in which Vishnuism and Shaivism are not so harmonious with relation to one another as might appear to be the case at first glance. For example, the traces of such a dualism can be seen in the Mahabharata, whose editing was, without a doubt, the work of Vishnuist circles. The Kauravas, the enemies of the Pandavas and the inveterate villains, are portrayed as inspired by Shiva and his retinue to the point that Shiva is considered to be a “subtle essence” in contrast to the metaphysical and purely spiritual nature of Krishna, the avatar of Vishnu. The parallel with the “devil” begs itself in this case, especially if we take into consideration Guénon’s indication that the “devil” belongs to the “subtle plane.”[6]

If we apply the Traditionalist approach to other sacred forms beyond Hinduism and Sufism, we find ourselves in a situation in which it becomes impossible to speak of counter-initiation as something universal and opposed to universal esotericism without falling into mythomania or moralistic dualism which, theoretically, should have been overcome insofar as we are considering the sphere of esotericism. In other words, every sacred form endowed with metaphysical uniqueness formulates in its own way its own theory of what “counter-initiation” is for it (and not only for it). At the same time, the positions of different traditions can coincide in some aspects, while in others they may diverge. Thus, we arrive at the affirmation of an absence of any one counter-initiatic doctrine or organization. Everything that is habitually included in the notion of “counter-initiation” turns out to be a plural, complex, and

multipolar reality. The definition of the nature and form of a counter-initiatic doctrine thus derives from the metaphysical particularity of each concrete tradition.

There is no denying the fact that, in recent centuries, there has been a glaringly overarching, broad process which undoubtedly represents a clearly pronounced tendency towards the construction of an anti-traditional society based on principles which are radically opposed to the sum of those which constitute the basis of any tradition.

But there is one exception here: Judaism. In the religious and metaphysical perspective of Judaism, the last centuries, starting in 1240 and especially since 1300, are seen as the prelude to messianic triumph. The fall of Christian civilization and the political liberation of Jewry (not to mention the contemporary successes of political Zionism and the establishment of the State of Israel) are seen as none other than the greatest metaphysical progress. Thus, on a matter over which the majority of traditions fully concur with one another, there is the exception of Judaism.

The external revival of confessional religions in recent years, following several centuries of active processes of de-sacralization and secularization, also fits poorly into Traditionalist logic. Although this [renewed] interest in religion is not as easily exposable of a parody as Neo-spiritualism and "New Age", it is clearly not a true spiritual rebirth.

In short, the problem of the "deviation of esotericism", or counter-initiation, is complicated not only by inter-confessional contradictions, whose origins can be traced back to metaphysics, but also internal transformations within these traditions relative to the stages of their history.

On top of all of this, there exist anomalous cases (Judaism, the new interest in religions in the West, etc.) which seemingly contradict the quite obvious tendency of progressive secularization on the basis of which Guénon attempted to substantiate his theory of counter-initiation and the latter's planetary plan to prepare the "reign of the Antichrist."

Counter-initiation and initiation are in solidarity with one another up to a certain point

Guénon's concept of counter-initiation is based on a scheme to which he adhered in relation to more general questions pertaining to the structure of Tradition. Guénon constantly bore in mind the following tripartite model:

[Diagram: A circle with a vertical axis. At the top is a point labeled 'D'. Below it is a horizontal line labeled 'D'. Below that is a point labeled 'D'. At the bottom is a point labeled 'D'. The vertical axis is labeled 'D' at the top and 'D' at the bottom. The horizontal line is labeled 'D' on the left and 'D' on the right. The points are labeled 'D' and 'D'.

1. Principle

2. Intermediary space

3. Periphery

In the center of the circle (or at the top of the anthropological and cosmic hierarchy, the vertical) is initiation, authentic esotericism, the Primordial Tradition, the one metaphysics. This is the inner sphere, the sphere of the initiated beyond confessional differences – the sphere of those who are to be found beyond the threshold of genuine esoteric organizations.

On the periphery (the horizontal plane) are the profane and the un-initiated. For them, the oneness of truth is hidden behind a variety of forms and labyrinths of moral and ethical standards. These are ordinary people who are not conscious of the true nature of things and events.

Finally, lying beyond the periphery, at the lower point of the vertical axis, is a kind of “anti-center.” This is counter-initiation, the place of the “saints of Satan.” Counter-initiation unites various tendencies not in a light synthesis, but in a dark mixture of infernal parody.

This model is obviously transparent and convincing. But the first difficulties with it arise when we attempt to explain the historical and geographical localization of counter-initiatic centers. At this point, it turns out, it is quite difficult to distinguish such centers from properly initiatic societies and orders. Determining on which side of the periphery – the inner or outer, the upper or lower – can be found this or that initiatic organization reveals itself to be extremely difficult (if not altogether impossible), and all external criteria can easily be simulated. Guénon specified that true esotericism is always metaphysically oriented, while counter-initiation remains on the level of cosmology or the “subtle world.” However, an enormous distance separates the profane world and the world of metaphysical principles. In the early stages, it is absolutely impossible to predict for sure whether an initiate will reach the end of this path to the actual metaphysical levels, or whether they will get stuck in the intermediary spheres. And if they “get stuck”, then how do they then differ from those who represent “counter-initiation”?

In other words, up to a certain point, and rather far from the sphere of the competence of the profane, the paths of initiation and counter-initiation are not only parallel, but essentially one. With respect to the orientations of “above” and “below” (which at first might seem to be convincing criteria) it should be noted that they are not indicative in direct initiatic experience, since ascent in the borderline sphere between the worldly and otherworldly is often accomplished by means of descent, a departure which leads straight into the abyss.[7]

If one makes it to the end of this path, the adept attains effective metaphysical realization. If one goes astray, all the attributes of counter-initiation will be glaring.

In other words, out of this simple tripartite scheme arises a more complex and less edifying picture, in which the main emphasis is put not on the orientation of movement, but on the reality of the achieved result. Thus, the problem of counter-initiation boils down to an incomplete and imperfect esoteric realization, not some kind of primordially and strictly “Satanic-oriented” secret society aiming to create and strengthen an anti-sacral civilization. The anti-sacral civilization which indeed has been built and is being built today, should be seen as the result of the overlapping of many incomplete realizations, first and foremost of an esoteric nature, the solidarity of which is obvious to all those who have been left half-satisfied with incomplete tendencies in their own sacred form.

The preponderance of profanism, fed by overall degeneration, is only a consequence of the degeneration of initiatic organizations themselves which, contradicting their primordial orientation, are

now content with intermediate surrogates and unrealized potencies instead of unceasingly and heroically striving towards the center of metaphysics. At the same time, that very “demonizing” force commonly referred to as “devilish” and “satanic” can hardly be held responsible for participating in this entire process. In fact, the most terrible and formidable results of perversion and de-sacralization are those achieved by people who have the best intentions and are convinced that they are orthodox bearers of the most obvious good. Every initiate who treats their spiritual path with affection, every cleric who considers his tradition and its dogma to be an ethical or moral convention, and every Traditionalist who settles down with reciting the phrases of their master, which are in appearance correct but rendered meaningless by the mental laziness of their followers – all of these types little by little build the structures of counter-initiation and sever the metaphysical apex from the pyramid of initiatic realization.

Those whom it is easiest to single-out as being “representatives of counter-initiation” on the basis of purely external criteria – e.g., open “Luciferians” or “Satanists” – sometimes exhibit tragedy, pain, non-conformism, and the ability to stare the terrible truth of apocalyptic reality straight in the eyes. Hence why they cannot fulfill the role of the main “scapegoats” for Traditionalists. Of course, some of them may be in solidarity with processes of de-sacralization, but this is more of an exception. More often than not, at least among those who take the matter seriously, the point is that, on the contrary, these types are still about rising up against de-sacralization; they stand against conformism with the degenerate world – a world to which many representatives of “orthodox” traditions, oddly enough, easily adapt and in which they manage to perfectly comfortably arrange themselves. More often than not, religious non-conformists (“heretics”, “Satanists”, etc.) are seeking the totality of sacral experience which the representatives of orthodoxy cannot offer them. This is not their fault, but their misfortune, and the true fault lies with those who have allowed authentic tradition to be turned into a flat facade behind which there is simply nothing. Perhaps it is none other than these “dubious” forces and groups who are grimly, desperately, perplexedly, stubbornly, yet heroically pursuing esotericism and initiation deep within reality, while the profane and the moralizing conformists who remain on the periphery of initiation are the ones hindering this path by all means.

If initiation and counter-initiation can be distinguished only in terms of the concrete experience of spiritual realization, then no external criteria can help on this matter. This conclusion begs itself especially if we recognize the universality of esotericism, a point on which Guénon insisted. This conclusion remains valid when we apply it to the esotericism of one sacred form taken individually. When we take into consideration the metaphysical contradictions which exist between different forms, then the matter becomes even more complicated.

From the Red Donkey to the Roman Pope

The main examples of counter-initiation to which Guénon pointed included the cult of the Egyptian god Set, whose remnants have survived since the most ancient times along with multiple snake cults in the Middle East. In Guénon's perspective, the mysterious brotherhood of the Red Donkey (or Red Dragon) exists to this day and is secretly directing the main processes of civilization in an infernal vein. If we digress from the "detective" flavor of this conceptualization, another consideration presents itself: How could an esoteric group of people engaged in the sacred – albeit in such an infernal, serpentine, and possibly fragmentary dimension – have provoked the modern world's complete ignorance of the sacred, and contributed to the widespread assertion of the primacy of quantity and the radically anti-initiatic approach characteristic of the modern way of life?

Compared to the maniacal system of global lies which we see in the modern mass media, secular utilitarian culture, and everyday lifestyles, any "snake-worshippers" would be an exotic and quite sympathetic group of romantic marginals. There must be a reality behind the anti-sacral aggression of the modern world which is much more formidable and much more thorough than the machinations of some exotic "black magicians." It is hardly likely that the scraps of ancient cults, even the most sinister ones, could be responsible for the anti-sacral collapse of the modern world. It is hardly likely that a dark and obviously minute sect wields such universality to the point that, in theory, it is capable of effectively influencing the most important events of world history and, most importantly, shaping the prevailing intellectual climate. If something of this sort really has taken place, then such an organization could not possibly have remained unnoticed, and there would be in circulation certain information about it which, although distorted, approximate, and amiss, would nonetheless be extensive.

It is still another matter if we take the bearers of some kind of metaphysical tradition that is radically opposite to the dominant religious culture to claim the role of counter-initiation. For example, an altogether respectable and pious Pars (Zoroastrian) could end up in India and, in one way or another, gain access to influence over the most important spheres.[8] In the context of Hinduism, he would fulfill an openly counter-initiatic function, insofar as Zoroastrian metaphysics is founded on the principle of Dvaita, whereas the metaphysical axis of Hinduism is Advaita. Such metaphysical subversion would be much more destructive than, say, the antinomies posed by radical Shaivist sects who, while being ethically questionable for their ritual devouring of people, sinister necromantic practices in wastelands and cemeteries, their Tantric orgies, etc., do not call into doubt the main metaphysical line of Advaita-Vedanta – on the contrary, they strengthen, affirm, and defend it.

The activities of a Kabbalist Jew within, say, the Islamic tradition or a Christian country, would bear the same counter-initiatic character, and the (negative) efficiency of such would be higher in relation to the depth and sophistication with which the Kabbalist understands the metaphysics of his own tradition (and vice versa).[9] Strictly speaking, an Orthodox metaphysician who is perfectly conscious of all the metaphysical implications of the dogma of the Trinity and who understands the whole depth of the contradictions between the Christian Gospel and the alienated creationism of Judaism and Islam, would by the will of fate become involved in the most important cultural-religious questions in the countries and cultures associated with the strict Abrahamic tradition, and could all together deal irreparable damage to their official ideology (and its limits in culture and politics) – naturally, this would be “damage” from the point of view of the stability and preservation of Abrahamic creativity in its older form. In practice, the presence of such overt or covert religious (and esoteric) groups in different states is an obvious fact, while the “snake-worshipers” are either completely unknown or are extravagant marginal oddities.

Now let us turn to Western civilization, which is the cradle of anti-sacral tendencies. In the West, the counter-initiatic tendencies which produced the monstrous result that we see today developed in several stages. The first stage, associated with Orthodox eschatology, was neglected by Guénon, who had a clearly inadequate opinion of the Christian tradition. This first stage consisted of the fall of Rome from Orthodoxy, the changing of the Symbol of Faith by Charlemagne, and the transition from the Orthodox and eschatological concept of the “symphony of powers” (associated with the metaphysics of the “withholder”, the Katechon) to the Papist (Guelphian) model, against which stood the Ghibelline Emperors of the Hohenstaufen who were just as dear to Guénon as they are to us. [10] Thus, the main sources of counter-initiation in the West should be sought in Catholic Scholasticism and the Vatican.

Unlike Orthodoxy, Catholicism lost its esoteric component, and this unleashed a whole spectrum of initiatic organizations of various stripes (Hermetic, proto-Masonic, etc.). Given that these initiatic organizations stemmed from an extra-Christian context (from pre-Christian cults and the Islamic and Jewish traditions), any alliance with the exoteric church was founded not on synthesis and organic unity, but on conformism and conventions. This Catholic civilization was so inorganic and unstable that even in its better periods (such as the Middle Ages), it harbored a number of dubious and at times openly counter-initiatic elements.

This unsustainable compromise was ultimately shaken, and both components of the Western tradition came into open contradiction. Catholicism rejected non-Christian esotericism and finally descended to

the level of contradictory, secularized Judeo-Christian morality. Autonomous esotericism, in the form of Freemasonry, became a destructive, rationalistic apparatus in essence anti-Christian and anti-esoteric. These halves of the disintegrating ensemble were marked by counter-initiatic features: in the very least, in the majority of cases the spiritual path towards metaphysical realization could not be stopped at the first stages, but it was simulated, forged, alienated, and turned into its opposite. The very first and most significant chord of such degeneration was the rejection of the completeness of Orthodox metaphysics. This was the most decisive step in the direction of counter-initiation within the Christian world.

After having remained for quite some time within the realm of fully-fledged, unified (at once Orthodox and Catholic) Christianity, which had preserved the fullness of its authentic metaphysics and initiation, the peoples and states of the West eventually, in one catastrophic moment, severed this chain. This was enshrined in the introduction of the dogma of the Filioque and in the sacredly-unauthorized conferment of the status of "Emperor" to the Frankish kings before their kind – this destroyed the symphony of powers in the West. Catholic (and later altogether secularized-Protestant) moralism, plus the anti-clerical, bureaucratic, philanthropic- demagogic rationalism of Masonry – all of this was much more counter-initiatic from the standpoint of fully-fledged Orthodox metaphysics than any splashes of anti-Church, pagan, or even "Luciferian" cults in the West, which perhaps represented but paroxysms of nostalgia for the complete and total Tradition, not even a hint of which had remained in the West since time immemorial.

This combination of Western anti-metaphysical Christianity (Catholicism and especially Anglo-Saxon Protestantism) with rationalistic Masonry (with the active participation of the Jewish factor, which played a significant conceptual role in the degradation of the West – after all, the fall of Edom, the "Christian world", is the condition of the triumph of Judaic messianism [11]) is what lies at the heart of the poisonous paradigm of the modern world. The role of "Satanists" or "representatives of the Order of Set" in all of this is not only negligible, but generally naught, especially since the very fact of such an order's existence is presumptive and based on extremely dubious evidence. Guénon cited the illustration of an artist from Cairo depicting a strange monster, the statue of which he allegedly saw in a secret sanctuary.[12] What would Guénon have said about the paintings of Dali, Ernst, or thousands of other avant-garde artists who depicted monstrous creatures on their canvases and told thousands of hallucinatory and narcotic tales?

Very telling in this regard is the story of Léo Taxil, the scandalous author of the late 19th century who was behind the forged revelations of the machinations of "Satanists." For the Catholics, Leo Taxil

described the secrets of “Satanic Freemasonry”, while for Masons he exposed the “perversions” and “black book magic” of the Catholic clergy. In fact, beyond his clearly adventurous personal aims, Taxil quite cleverly showed how representatives of both Western organizations (one embodying exotericism, the other esotericism) were not so much “devil- worshipers” as gullible fools. This grotesque idiocy on the part of both conservatives and progressives is perhaps the most expressive sign of the parody which Guénon himself called the easily recognizable “seal of the devil.”

In fact, Traditionalists and Guénon’s followers have not been able to avoid the same fate, as they uncritically repeat various (and often frankly disputable) maxims of the master and have reached the very same “scholastic parody”, the signs of which were clearly noticed by the much wiser and non-conformist, although no less controversial Baron Julius Evola.

The absence of counter-initiatic symbolism in the Primordial Tradition

Now a few words about the Primordial Tradition. From our point of view, the contours of this Tradition were outlined with amazing clarity in the works of the German Professor Herman Wirth, a review of whose book Guénon published in *Études traditionnelles*.^[13] According to Wirth, all existing mythological plots, symbols, religious dogma and rituals, and moreover all human languages and alphabets, evolved from a single calendric proto-form: the Sacred Circle, accompanied by an arrangement of proto-runic signs.^[14] This proto-form was a description of the natural phenomena observed by humanity at the North Pole on the ancient disappeared continent of Hyperborea (or Arktogaa). Thus, out of an abstract concept, the Primordial Tradition became a tangible and concrete reality of a paradigm whose main contours were extremely convincingly and voluminously revealed by Herman Wirth.^[15]

What interests us in the Hyperborean calendric proto-form is that realm which is associated with the dark, nocturnal sectors, corresponding to the Polar Night and its related symbolism. This is the period of the winter solstice, or Great Yule, the main festival, symbolic and ritual center of the whole structure of the Primordial Tradition. Counter-initiation, according to Guénon’s definition, is related to the negative aspects of universal symbolism and, as follows, in the Hyperborean complex corresponds to those realities describing the state of the Polar Night, the decline of the sun, and other symbolic analogues of this event. The snake and wolf often function as such symbols, frequently imagined as swallowing the

sun in the polar winter. This darkness is also identifiable with Mother Earth, from which all living beings come and whither all return to be reborn again.

This primordial picture, which is strictly cyclical and harmonious, preceded the division of this symbolic complex into positive and negative elements. The snake, the wolf, darkness, the underground realms (where the sun descends), death, and night do not have strictly negative significations. All aspects of the cycle are equally important and necessary – the sunset is just as sacred as the sunrise, and without the sun's "dying" there can be no spring, no rebirth in the New Year. Therefore, the same symbols have both negative and positive aspects. This is an essential point: at hand is not an artificial theological concept seeking to consciously identify positive in negative and negative in positive (like the famous Chinese symbol of Yin-Yang), but rather a special state of consciousness which, in principle, does not know the very idea of negative.[16] It is precisely by virtue of this state that Tradition is indeed Primordial and Integral, that is, preceding any particular interpretation. The possibility for different interpretations of this primordial symbolism is embedded in the overall picture, and such interpretations are what constitute the content (and background) of historical religions and mythologies which evolved into stable symbolical and doctrinal complexes at the cost of metaphysically and ethically emphasizing only certain aspects of the one Hyperborean proto-form to the detriment of others.

It can be said that the "Hyperborean Tradition" was simultaneously dual and non-dual, trinitarian and unitary, monotheistic and polytheistic, matriarchal and patriarchal, sedentary and nomadic. Only later did it split into several branches separated from and opposed to one another.

The Primordial Tradition does not annul the metaphysical differences between traditions, since it is in this regard strictly neutral. It provides a general context; it employs a system of correspondences and symbolic series which allow one to explain the most mysterious and darkest aspects of symbolism, mythologies, religious doctrines, and sacred tropes. With regards to metaphysics, this Primordial Tradition is limited to being a mere statement of fact. The metaphysical question attains its real intensity in completely different conditions, those removed as far as possible from the Golden Age of the polar civilization. This, in fact, is why it is impossible to agree with Guénon on the esoteric unity of traditions, since they are not unified on a metaphysical level, but rather unified in the sense of descending from a single sacred cult-symbolological complex, a universal language, the basic element at the origins of all the varieties of human culture and human religion. The use of this language can serve to express the most diverse theological and metaphysical constructs, but they all concern one and the

same archetypal structure, which they merely interpret and whose metaphysical accents they rearrange in different ways.

As follows, the symbolic complex which would be associated with counter-initiation, in its most universal aspect, should be that relating to the Hyperborean mystery of Yule. Strictly negatively interpreting this complex might lead to grotesque distortions, to the point that the most important and sacred aspects are treated as “counter-initiatic.” This, according to Herman Wirth, is what happened with the Christian tradition when it equated various “solar-thresholding” Hyperborean tropes with demonic realities, even though their symbolisms are strikingly reminiscent of the calendric history of the birth of the Son of God (the winter solstice). For instance, the demon’s tail was a vestige of the solar-solstice rune connoting the lower part of the polar year and the roots of the world tree. The cauldrons in which the demons cooked sinners were derived from the trope of the winter cauldron (or vessel) of the gods – the cauldron of the Celtic god Dagda which never runs empty. This is a typical winter-solstice motif (and the New Year rune itself was still called Dagda in the Normans’ time, and was depicted as a bowl or cauldron). The horns of the “devil” are a symbol of the spring Resurrection of the sun, as they are the symbolic analogue of the two raised hands – the spring rune “Ka.”[17] And so on.

These considerations show that it is impossible to judge the counter-initiatic character of one or another symbol or symbolological complex on purely formal grounds, since in Hyperborean symbolism, which lies at the heart of all sacred symbolism, there are no such symbols.

Conclusion

Summating our brief analysis, it should be clear that it is necessary to radically reconsider Guénon’s theory of counter-initiation and carefully consider the various standpoints involved in this matter. This problem is closely connected to other theses of Guénon’s which, upon attentive study and application to concrete historical religions and initiatic schools, turn out to be too rough, inaccurate, or frankly erroneous. At the same time, this revision in no way tarnishes the high authority of René Guénon. Without his works and most important theses and interpretive models, the whole picture of esotericism and metaphysics would be hopelessly confused today. The point is not to debunk the master, as some of his ungrateful students, such as Frithjof Schuon, have sought to do. On the contrary, it is necessary to refine and hone the great intuitions of this genius human being in order to cleanse his teachings of all that has turned out wrong, and in order to make shine with new strength and freshness those aspects which are expressions of the purest truth. Guénon bequeathed to us an invaluable tool, an excellent methodology for studying Tradition. Thanks to him, we can determine the common denominators of the enormous materials of theology, the history of religions, initiation, etc., with which we have to deal, and

which would otherwise remain hopelessly contradictory fragments defying any systematization (not to mention neo-Spiritualist reconstructions or the theories of profane historians and ethnologists).

Guénon remains the main and key author. But if, following serious reflections and the results of careful research, we arrive at conclusions which do not concur with his views but correct them, then it is pointless to try to hide and pretend that everything remains unchanged. The question of counter-initiation is highly important and extremely relevant. So is the question of the existence (or non-existence) of a real metaphysical unity of traditions. This text is merely an introduction to this problem, but as an outline for further research it is of colossal significance. We hope to develop this topic in subsequent works.

In the meanwhile, let us remark that an adequate view of counter-initiation, a clarification of its nature, essence, and “localization”, will lead us to the most horrifying secrets which, while hidden behind the dubious myth of the modern world, are ready to find their nightmarish, chilling incarnation in front of a hopelessly slumbering humanity drowsily wandering towards slaughter. Contrary to the naive stories of the “Order of the Red Donkey” and exotic and relatively harmless “Luciferians”, the true mission of counter-initiation is dizzyingly large-scale, effective, and ubiquitous. It is preparing a terrible fate for all peoples and civilizations. But in order to recognize this approaching catastrophe, it is necessary to look at things soberly and intently beyond the romantic haze of residual occultism and the “detective plot” of cheap horror novels.

Nothing rejoices the “enemy of humankind” more than the deafening stupidity of those who hastily decide to embark on the path of struggle against him without seriously weighing all the circumstances and assessing the whole volume of that unfathomable and terrible problem which St. Paul the Apostle called the “mystery of iniquity.”

Footnotes:

[1] We addressed this topic in detail in: Alexander Dugin, *Metafizika Blagoi Vesti. Pravoslavny ezoterizm* (The Metaphysics of the Gospel: Orthodox Esotericism, Moscow: Arktogetia, 1996). This work contains a detailed scrutiny of Guénon's Christological views arising from his confessional belonging to Islam, not from any correspondences between their "univocal esoteric truth." Generally speaking, despite the fact that Guénon wrote very little about the Islamic tradition, the majority of his theses on the esoteric question arose precisely out of his Islamic views on things. Hindu Advaita-Vedanta and Sufi Islam were most dear to Guénon. The specific approaches to esotericism proper to these two traditions considerably shaped Guénon's preferences and analyses in the sphere of historical religions and their dogmas. Regardless of how logical or harmonic these two systems might be, they still far from exhaust all the possible variations of esoteric and initiatic doctrines.

[2] See: Dugin, *Metafizika Blagoi Vesti*.

[3] Christianity is counted among the Abrahamic traditions only in the Islamic perspective and some Judeo-Christian currents. Orthodoxy cannot recognize such a title insofar as it is clearly conscious of its internal spiritual nature as a Melchizedekian, pre-Abrahamic, and supra-Abrahamic tradition.

[4] Dugin, *Metafizika Blagoi Vesti*, chapter 41. [5] Ibid. `

[6] Is this too really the case? The logic of our analysis suggests that the matter is somewhat more complex.

[7] We can recall the case of Dante's initiatic journey where, at the very bottom of the crater of hell, he began to descend down Satan's body even lower, ultimately reaching not the center of the abyss, but the surface of the earth near Purgatory and the hill of earthly paradise. This category also contains a number of symbols which situate paradise under the earth, demons at the tops of the mountains, etc.

[8] For example, the husband of Indira Gandhi was a Pars (Zoroastrian).

[9] This is the case with the Dönme, the followers of the Jewish pseudo-messiah Sabbatai Zevi, who outwardly followed their leader in adopting Islam, but who, when heading the Turkish state in the 20th century, immediately abolished Islam as the state religion and proclaimed the creation of a “civilization of the Western type” in Turkey. Even though they were absolutely traditional with regards to their esoteric Kabbalist community and loyal to the general context of the Jewish Diaspora, the Dönme carried out what is from a purely Islamic perspective an anti-Islamic, profane mission.

[10] See Dugin, *Metafizika Blagoi Vesti*.

[11] See the article “The Messianism of Kabbalah: The Metaphysics of the Nation, the Messiah, and the End Times in the Zohar” in *Mily Angel* 3 (1998).

[12] Here is a fragment from Guénon’s letter to a certain Hillel in 1930 which describes this history: “Here behind al-Azhar (a university in Cairo) there is an old gentleman who strikingly resembles the portraits of Ancient Greek philosophers and produces strange paintings. He once showed us a drawing of a dragon with the head of a bearded man in a 16th century hat with six small heads from various animals protruding from his beard. It is especially curious that this figure clearly resembles an image found in *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes* as an illustration of the book *L’élue du dragon*. This illustration is supposed to have been taken from some ancient book...But the real gem is that this gentleman claims to have seen this head elsewhere and painted it exactly like the original!”

[13] See: *Mily Angel* 1 (1991).

[14] See: Herman Wirth, “Das Heilige Jahr” in *Der Aufgang der Menschheit* (Jena: Eugen Diedrichs, 1928). Translated into Russian by Alexander Dugin as “Sviashchennyi God” and published in *Mily Angel* 3 (1998). See also Alexander Dugin, “Kosmicheskii Spasitel” (“The Cosmic Savior”) in the same number.

[15] See Alexander Dugin, *Giperboreiskaiia teoriia* (“The Hyperborean Theory”, Moscow: Arktogeia, 1993).

[16] Contemporary linguistics divides types of thinking into two main varieties – “digital” and “analog.” “Digital” thinking precisely corresponds to profanism and materialism, operates with the abstract categories of “there is” and “there is not”, and functions according to the laws of formal logic (the law of the excluded third, the law of identity, etc.). Philosophers call this “classical rationality.” Analog thinking became a scientific category over the course of the study of archaic “primitive” peoples, cultures, and mythologies. Analog thinking corresponds to the world of Tradition and retains connection with traces of the Hyperborean tradition. It knows no “pure negation.” “Not” therefore means “another yes.” Pure absence is unimaginable, as the very concept of “absence” immediately evokes the image of “another presence.” Analog thinking first affirms the whole image, and only then deconstructs it into categories of “presence”, “absence”, “positive”, “negative”, and even “male”, “female”, “big”, and “small.” In analog thinking, there is no strict distinction between the subject of action and the object of action, between the substance and the attribute, the action and the substantive. Thus, in our example, the sun, its disappearance, and its absence act as something whole and integral. The affirmation of the sun already contains its negation (setting in winter), and the negation of the sun (winter darkness) is an affirmation which testifies to the meaning of the sun. On the basis of this logic, the primordial symbolism in principle was not subject to moral interpretation. It was a system of interrelated, integral, sacred elements, none of which is endowed with a value-priority. Everything in it was an expression of the one sacred Being, the Light of the World, at different stages of its cyclical pulse.

[17] See Dugin, “Kosmicheskii Spasitel’”, op cit.

Deconstructing the “Contemporal Moment”: New Horizons in the History of Philosophy

April 11, 2018

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 1 of Noomakhia: Voyny Uma – Tri Logosa: Apollon, Dionis, Kibela (Noomakhia: Wars of the Mind – Three Logoi: Apollo, Dionysus, Cybele) (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2014).

The contemporal moment: destruction/deconstruction

It is obvious that the history of philosophy must be studied by determining a starting point beforehand. It seems a matter of course that we would automatically take such to be the contemporal moment. The contemporal moment means the “here and now”, *hic et nunc*. This moment acts as our starting position, as our “observatory point” from which we can survey philosophy as the history of philosophy. The history of philosophy thus unfolds in our direction, towards us. This concerns both time and place: philosophy is historically situated between its “sources” (for example, the pre-Socratics) and the situation in the 21st century (in its philosophical self-reflection). As a rule, this temporal vector is more or less reflexive, hence why the main (axial) discipline in all sectors of philosophy is the history of philosophy. By virtue of fixating on this historico-philosophical vector, we acquire the possibility to be involved in this process, to consolidate our own position as that of a “philosopher” in a historico-philosophical structure. This is the *nunc*, the “now”, the temporal sector in which our thinking is placed, if it wants to be “philosophical.”

Hence follows the rather important conclusion that was fully drawn between Heidegger and his call for “phenomenological destruction” in *Sein und Zeit* [1], and Jacques Derrida who developed this thesis into the methodology of “deconstruction” [2]. The history of philosophy, according to Heidegger, is tethered in his case to ontology, to the question of being, and, thereby being an onto-history, *Seynsgeschichtliche*, is a continuity of stages at each of which the question of being is treated uniquely. As follows, the history of philosophy is a logical structure or a series of logical structures which can be more or less described in ontological terms which in turn determine the place and significance of a philosophy or

philosophical school in the overall historico-philosophical process. Determining a philosopher or school's place in this continuity, which has strict temporal and cultural frameworks (from the pre-Socratics to Nietzsche to Heidegger himself), is equivalent to correctly understanding their philosophy and, accordingly, allows for the meaning of such to be revealed. This is ontological destruction – the placement of a philosopher or philosophical tendency through the revelation of the fundamental paradigm of their ontological positions (often hidden, veiled, or implicit) in a strictly notional sequence:

The First Beginning (pre-Socratics) -> The End of the First Beginning (Plato and Aristotle) -> the middle – the Middle Ages (Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, etc.) -> The Beginning of the End – New Time (modernity – Descartes, Leibniz, and up to Kant) -> The End of the End (Hegel and Nietzsche).

Destruction is the placement of a philosopher into this sequence in order to reveal his place in the history of philosophy, and thus the meaning of his philosophizing.

For Jacques Derrida, the history of philosophy is a text, the structure of which is determined by the intersections of semantic lines. This is a view which more or less repeats, albeit in nuanced and detailed form, Heidegger's axial construction. Thus, for both Heidegger and Derrida, it is important to place a philosopher in the context in which the semantics of his constructs are found to represent quotations, polemics, or the overturning or reproduction of the discourses that are at disposal before and around him in the "grammatological fabric." In this case, deconstruction is the attentive inspection of this fabric's patterns, in which any "authorship" is conceived as no more than a locus of quotations compiled in an ordered manner. Philosophy, thus, is one field of connotation, and its history comprises changes in the predominant connotative matrices and interpretive algorithms. Between Heidegger and Derrida, we can place Michel Foucault and his epistemology.

Of course, such hermeneutical models of the history of philosophy distinctly crystallized around the end of the 20th century. In the 19th century, and earlier, the "contemporal moment" was described in other terms. For Kant, it was paired with the revelation of the structures of "transcendental reason", for Hegel such was the "end of history" and the "objective spirit." For Nietzsche, there was the maximization of the will to power in the figure of the Übermensch. In Marx, there was the horizon of the world proletarian revolution. In all cases, philosophy has been conceived exclusively as a teleological process – whether by those who have tried to give this teleology fixed forms, or those who, on the contrary, have understood history as the accumulation of a "quantity" of individual freedom (Stirner, Bergson or von Hayek/Popper).

For all of these teleologies – both the naive ones of the 19th century and those 20th century theories based on critical reflection, structuralism, and phenomenological corrections (as well as the philosophy of language and psychoanalysis) – the “contemporal moment” serves as an “observatory point”, and he who stands at this observatory point and has considered the content of the moment itself and its structures (no matter who this “someone” might be – the subject, Dasein, a rhizome, a deciphering system, a “body without organs”, a hermeneutic) is the key to the history of philosophy capable of interpreting it in relation to themselves. This is very important, since in such a perspective any preceding “contemporal moment” is conceived as a “preliminary”, “unfinished”, “incomplete” one compared to the current contemporal moment and, as follows, the nunc cannot be adequately described prius, as it does not convert into the past the “contemporality” of the present. In a certain sense, this is history as such, and the history of philosophy is the philosophical conceptualization of its structure.

The French philosopher Henry Corbin used the neologism *historial* in order to translate the meaning of Heidegger’s expression *Seynsgeschichtliche* (“onto-historical”) into French. The *historial* is the structure of the “contemporal moment” which predetermines its content as a teleological vector whose tip points to the nunc and presumes its beginning in the embryonic formation of the Logos.

In one way or another, any attempt to conceptualize the moments in the history of philosophy (of individual philosophers or their schools) beyond the *historial*, i.e., without deconstruction taking into account such explicit and convincing reflections (phenomenology, Heidegger, Post-Modernity), will look not simply naive, but ludicrous. In the context of the *historial*, any attempt to read Plato or Hegel outside of their notional sequence, which was in one way or another noted by philosophers in the last quarter of the 20th century, would mean falling into the self-deceit of unreflexive and unstructured quoting with a guaranteed loss of semantic links. If a reading of this or that philosopher does not flow in the context of this historico-philosophical grille de la lecture, i.e., without a thorough review of this observatory point where it is situated – or, in other words, on the other end of destruction/deconstruction operations – then nonsense is guaranteed. Not a single expression, not a single review, not a single intellectual procedure stands a chance at being correctly conceptualized, and instead of philosophy and the history of philosophy, we are left with the “white noise” of gloomy cognition, a simulacrum of thinking.

This is first and foremost the case with the nunc, the *historial*, or the temporal aspect of philosophy. The matter stands somewhat differently with the spatial aspect, the *hic*.

The topos of the present: the West as a spatial telos

The contemporal moment is situated not only in a temporal sequence, but also in space, on a scale of synchronic territory. If modern philosophy has devoted enormous, if not all of its attention to the first aspect of the contemporal moment, then spatiality has been left outside of the sphere of interests. Western philosophy is wholly and completely "tempo-centric." Consequently, in it Sein is bound to Zeit, and this bondage is absolute, as a result of which Raum, or space, is studied merely as a residual principle, as an accident. Kant placed space closer to the object; Descartes altogether identified the object with "extense" (res extensa) in contrast to the subject (res cogens). In new European philosophy, thought is the property of the subject; consequently, time is the basis of philosophy and its context. Hence the historial as a measure.

It is telling that even critiques of the structuralists' historico-philosophical understanding have by almost no means whatsoever addressed the fate of space in philosophy and philosophical self-reflection. The principle of "spatiality" has been integrated in the form of a synchronic topology intended to serve as a semantic scale for interpreting the content of time. In other words, structuralist topology only serves the historial in the spirit of the Heideggerian sequence or Derrida's grammatological field.

But if we upset the habitual frameworks of new European philosophy and nevertheless pose the question of "where?" with regards to the observatory point, and if we fix the hic in the famous expression hic et nunc, then we have a specific civilizational concept of the West. The West in this case strictly fulfills the same teleological function as the "now." The contemporal moment is situated in the West, and is the point towards which all the rays of possible thinking converge, thus achieving their epiphany in none other than the West. The West is the birthplace of the Logos; the Logos is itself in the "evening land", Hesper, Abendland. This was more or less obvious for the cultural ethnocentrism of the Greeks. It was the core of the Romans' legal and political self-consciousness, and it became the axis of ecumenism. Then it was incarnated in the concept of universal progress in modernity. It remains the main driving force of the processes of globalization.

Husserl spoke of "European humanity" as a philosophical quintessence of the human as such. Heidegger directly and explicitly equated philosophy with Europe.

The West is the telos of earthly space just as the present is the telos of the past. Thus, "modern" philosophy can only be Western philosophy, and just as the present is the essence of the past, so is the Western the essence of the non-Western. Between nunc and hic there is thus present a direct analogy: time (the historial, or Karl Jaspers' axial time) convenes in the "now" and space in the "here", interpreted as "here in the West." And in precisely the same way that the past is conceived as the not-yet-present, so is the non-Western (for example, the eastern) thought of as the not-yet-Western.

This Western European, spatio-teleological character of the contemporal moment is conceptualized much less distinctly than the historial and the structures of the history of philosophy. Unlike the paramount discipline that is philosophy which deals with the deconstruction of time, spatial correctives and schematizations are the prerogative of the applied, secondary, and even barely institutionalized sciences with weakly developed philosophical apparatuses, such as geopolitics or international relations. On a more serious level, only the first attempts have been made at relativizing the Eurocentrism of modern philosophy as such, as with Edward Said's introduction of the notion of "orientalism" or the more foundational but not so generalized studies of cultural, social, and structural anthropology.

It is none other than the West for which the absolutization of time and radical tempo-centrism are characteristic. In reducing the historial to a structure, something constructed, and departing from the present, we automatically produce a concentric model of civilizational space in which the West is situated in the center and all the rest of humanity is in the periphery.

Just as attempting to read this or that philosopher in isolation from the historial (without deconstruction and, consequently, beyond the contemporal grille de la lecture) is today philosophical nonsense, the same status is held by all those attempts at substantiating the relevance of non-Western forms of philosophy – in the best cases, they can be examined as extravaganza, and in the worst as obtrusive attempts by ignoramuses to force themselves upon a scientific problem on equal terms with the opinion of a scholar. What can a not-yet-Logos tell a Logos that the Logos itself does not know?

Thus we have ascertained the structure of the contemporal moment as analyzed from a temporal and spatial point of view.

Post-Modernity and distance

In the structure of post-modern philosophy, the historial is subject to steadfast analysis, and at times this attention is so detailed that the spatial aspect and characteristic Eurocentrism of Western philosophy also come into view. Combined with an anthropological approach, this yields definite preconditions for not only recognizing the structure of the observatory point as such, but also establishing a certain distance from it. The intensive reflections of post-Heideggerian (post-modern) philosophy on the nature of time, and the first glimpses into conceptualizing the spatial situation of contemporality bring us to an entirely new horizon and radically deeper level of philosophical self-

reflection. What if the very observatory point from which we survey the history of philosophy, and from departing which we engage in deconstruction, is in turn nothing more than a “philosophical construct?” In other words, to what extent is the very idea of the teleology of the present moment qualified, and as follows, is tempo-centrism justified? Is the historial that serves us as a reliable tool for interpreting philosophy in turn an ephemeral and non-historical paradigm projected into the present which is not cumulative-teleological (regarding content), but arbitrary or arranged in accordance with a mechanism different from the vector of “axial time?” Finally, is the West the “only place” of the Logos, the zone towards which converge the rays of consciousness, or is this only one of many spatial receptacles of thinking alongside others? Does this mean that Eurocentrism is justified at its heart, and does it not follow that we should look for other, uniquely fully-fledged and complete dialects of the Logos?

These suspicions, of course, are left in the periphery of the philosophy of Post-Modernity, in the shadow of more habitual, inertial trends which, although are enriched, detailed, and introspective procedures, perpetuate the “dogmatic” vector of classical Western rationalism. Post-Modernity usually justifies and substantiates itself with routine practices of the contemporal moment, but the post-modern attitude nevertheless makes such suspicions and conjectures wholly natural. This inspires among those most of all worried about the possibility of breaking with the traditions of Western Modernity rather natural concerns: will Post-Modernity not altogether lead to the liquidation of the fulcra of the Western European Logos as such? If distance from the contemporal moment itself might be, even if only theoretically, justifiable, then all the claims of Western European humanity to universality immediately crumble, and this means no more nor less than the collapse of the Logos. Heidegger clearly recognized this prospect and posited that, nonetheless, the West’s teleology and contemporal moment, exposed to nihilistic catastrophe, should and could be overcome only through this moment and only in the West. This proposal consisted not in retreating from the observatory point, but in deepening the bottomless of its fall in order to, in this dramatic collapse, discover the mystery of its meaning and soar up to thrust forth Another Beginning for philosophy. Heidegger deliberately interpreted the shadow unleashed by Post-Modernity as a refusal of the burden of the “difficult knowledge of nihilism.” The decline of Europe, according to Heidegger, is the decline of being itself, and it should be experienced as such.

In post-Heideggerian philosophy, Heidegger’s tragism and heroism were rather quickly adapted into the routine of the new methodology; the anti-technological call to recognize the bottomless nothingness of such in turn became a technology. But postmodernism, albeit vapid and dubious, perhaps even by virtue of its refusal to sink deeper into the dizzying passivity of desperate Heideggerian nihilism, and at the same time not being in any position to turn Dasein’s mode of existence into authenticity (denying the Decision, *Entscheidung*), nevertheless slightly opened up the possibility for a step in this direction. If the Logos of the West, as far as one can tell, did not accept the Heideggerian invitation to implode, to explode in its own night, then in the very least it dissipated into bits of postmodern miasma and prepared for the last figure of dissolution. The fixation of distance with regards to the moment of contemporality and the clear and intelligible understanding of its “arbitrariness” (in spatial and temporal

senses) is already the *fait accompli* end of the West, its philosophical end. For those for whom the *telos* of the historical was the only permissible “lifeworld”, this meant the “end of everything.” But here is where the most significant aspect manifests itself: what if the historical, with its fundamental tempo-centrism and concomitant Eurocentrism, with the structure of its Logos and grating deconstruction/ontological destruction, is but one among numerous and equivalent possibilities for reasonably organizing the world? If this is so, then the finale experienced by Western philosophy is no more than an episode in a more complex and multipolar philosophical picture where there might be multiple observatory points and multiple understandings of time, space, and Logos.

Post-Modernity as a whole, of course, does not gravitate in this direction, remaining as it has under the wonted hypnosis of its Eurocentric contemporality, but the distance in question here becomes an open possibility with the dissipation of the European Logos. In Post-Modernity, the structures of this Logos become so blurred and scattered, so unintelligible and weak, that breaking with their suggestiveness turns out to be an extremely easy endeavor. That the strength of this Logos’ inertia is such that the clutch of its impact on the people of the West themselves does not let up even when the nature of rationality itself withers and dissipates in front of their very eyes – that is another matter altogether. The ends no longer come together and liberation from dogma leads to liberation from the process of liberation by virtue of which the subject itself evaporates – after all, Post-Modernity recognizes not only God, but man himself as an “apparatus of suppression”, a “repressive machine”, and thus the freedom of man transforms into freedom from man. This is the logical result. It is a paradox, but today higher humanism means dehumanization or transhumanization. Tragedy thus imperceptibly slips into farce.

Simply stepping away from the observatory point becomes a simple endeavor only for those capable of digressing from the residual hypnosis of the historical, which means that it is by no means simple. Nonetheless, the philosophical space for this has been prepared, and if the distance which we have been discussing is taken as the object of our heightened attention, then we can rather easily differentiate a spectrum of philosophical procedures with which we can feel out a different fulcrum or even a whole constellation of such fulcra in order to, departing from it/them, observe and subject the contemporal moment to deconstruction, thus demolishing the ponderability of temporal and spatial teleology, i.e., the Western Logos’ claims to exclusivity.

Hence the proposal to move in the direction of this new distance and new fulcra, and let the dead bury their dead.

The phenomenology of philosophy as a method

How can this distance be embodied in philosophical practice? Theoretically, the most principled manner is to escape the hypnosis of the contemporal moment, to calmly and with complete self-control refuse the pressure posed by both the historial (the trajectory of the history of philosophy towards the point at which we find ourselves on the scale of historical temporality) and Eurocentrism. To this end, philosophy can be seized through several strategies:

the phenomenological

the anthropological

the Traditionalist

Surely there are other ways by which to resolve this issue, but for now we limit ourselves to these three trajectories. Let us begin with phenomenology. The phenomenologist philosophers, setting before themselves the goal of clarifying the structure of the processes of logical thinking at the first stage, that preceding the engagement of properly logical (in the spirit of Aristotle) procedures of reasoning, transitioned from revealing the nature of intentionality (Brentano) to the concepts of noesis or noema and the "lifeworld" (Husserl). This line was picked up and developed in a particularly original manner by early Heidegger, as a result of which he arrived at Dasein. Phenomenology proposes that we focus our attention on studying the structures of thinking in their pre-logical phases, when consciousness "naively" and "uncritically" operates with its own "representations" (Vorstellungen), by substituting the objects themselves theoretically outside of the subject with the corresponding noema inhabiting consciousness. This logic is constructed upon ascertaining the obvious (evidential) ostensibility of the object, thus as a matter of course accomplishing the step of transcendentalizing. At the heart of this process lies phenomenality itself, on which consciousness usually does not fixate as it instantly flies above this level. However, in phenomenologists' opinion, it is none other than this phenomenality which is the most authentic and evidential state, and all other procedures of consciousness, including rational logic, are built on top of such with a greater or lesser degree of self-reflection. Thus, in order to achieve a precise and scientifically credible tracing of the basic processes of gnosiology on which thinking, logic, philosophy and science are built, it is necessary to intentionally study the phenomenal level which affects all other stages, hiding under their complexity and thereby dimming clear representations of nature and basic trajectories of thought.

The phenomenological method has been borrowed by the most diverse humanitarian disciplines from sociology to anthropology and psychology. Everywhere where it has been employed, the point has been explaining the arrangement and mechanisms of those structures on a level lesser and more primordial than that of logical thinking. Heidegger constructed his existential analytics on this basis.

In the field of the history of religions, the phenomenological method was actively used by Henry Corbin, who argued that religious doctrines cannot be understood on the grounds of purely, rationally formulated theological dogma and doctrines or by ignoring the inner experience of religious life. It is precisely studying this experience, which may very well contradict our ideas about the structure of the real, possible, and actual, that only can and should construe more complex religious systems. If we ignore this “lifeworld” of the religious person, then our understanding of religious doctrine will be superficial and completely incorrect. After all, we would miss the main and most essential foundation, that upon which such doctrine is built and whose structures it produces (whether revealing or, on the contrary, veiling them). Therefore, Corbin, who studied Islamic mysticism and Iranian Shi’ism in particular, emphasized that in order to understand religion, one must learn to live it from within. Hence why, in some passages, Corbin, himself a Protestant, wrote “we, Shiites” and believed that without such methodological identification with the sphere under study, without such immersion into the phenomenology of religious experience, no reliable judgement concerning the religion under study is possible.

Franz Boas’ cultural anthropology and Claude Lévi-Strauss’ structural anthropology call for studying archaic societies in a similar manner. Archaic man lives in a phenomenal world qualitatively different from the one in which the man of European Modernity lives. They differ not only on the level of development of logical thinking (as the sociologist and ethnologist Lucien Lévy-Bruhl tried to demonstrate), but in the profoundly different organization of the world of phenomena, including taxonomies, the allocation of basic entities, symmetries, and classifications. Lévi-Strauss argued that in archaic tribes and non-literate cultures we are dealing not with a pre-logical type of thinking, but with a different kind of logic that is no less developed than that of European people in Modernity, but is structured around different algorithms and thereby yields different results and gnosiological/ontological systems.

In sociology, an analogous method was employed by Husserl’s student, Alfred Schütz, who proposed to study society by abstracting oneself from the sum of our a priori knowledge of such and any notions of the purported “objectivity” of existing (non-existing) objects of the outside world and their autonomous significance. Different societies, in Schütz’s understanding, operate with different “lifeworld” structures; as follows, they construct different phenomenological systems which at the next stage determine their views of reality, whether internal, external, subjective, objective, etc. Analogous methods were applied by Harold Garfinkel, the founder of “ethnomethodology” who, like Schütz, focused his attention on the “horizons of everyday life” and “practices of everyday life.”

But here is what is interesting: phenomenology as such originally took shape as a philosophical current and was only later applied to other sciences – the phenomenological method was not applied to philosophy itself. Phenomenologist philosophers themselves based their theories on the contemporary

moment and, moreover, considered phenomenology to be a more precise and reflective expression of contemporality itself. In its historical movement along the path of scientific process and with its increasing refinement of the methodology of its logical thinking, at one point "European humanity" (Husserl) began developing the sphere of philosophy not in breadth (extensively), but in depth (intensively). This was largely because the expansion of reason had reached its natural borders. This deeper plunge into reason itself is not a step back on the path of singular process in raising the general level of rationality, but a step forward allowing to make those spheres which had previously evaded the arranging and authority of logical procedures into objects of rational attention. Albeit with significant corrections, Heidegger's philosophy was built in this vein. Philosophical phenomenology, thus, is not only not equivalent to the phenomenology of philosophy, but altogether does not imply the possibility of the latter.

Nevertheless, by making a reverse circle and moving through phenomenological sociology, anthropology, ethnology, and the phenomenology of religion, we can try to apply the phenomenological method to philosophy itself by employing a method opposite to that of deconstruction that reveals the structure of the historical. This is an invitation to perceive this or that philosophical system outside of the context of the history of philosophy, outside of the context of our knowledge about the structure of time, history, reality, the subject and object, and outside of ontology, which we have erected on the basis of the contemporal moment (whether consciously or by inertia). In other words, the phenomenology of philosophy offers the possibility of authentically experiencing the phenomenological basis at the heart of a concrete philosophical Logos, which is taken as a reliable contemporal moment only at a distance from the contemporal moment which constitutes the structure of our philosophical "I." Thus, an anthropologist immerses himself in the life of an archaic tribe in order to understand its language, its senses, and beliefs from within this life itself, from the experience of being within the tribe, and not from the grounds of superficial comparison with terms, things, practices, meanings, and beliefs which he knows from his personal experience of belonging to modern Western civilization. Since Boas, and especially under the influence of Lévi-Strauss, only field studies grounded in the method of "participant observation", empathy, and immersion in the phenomenology of the lifeworld of an archaic tribe are considered anthropologically credible. The phenomenology of philosophy should be constructed in a similar way: in order to understand how this or that philosopher thought, it is necessary to trace his thought from the lifeworld to the logical formulation of thought on the high level of logical expression. But this is possible only at a distance from the contemporal moment and its fundamental content, i.e., through the procedure of removing the philosophical identity of the phenomenologist of philosophy. In Heidegger we can see attempts at such a reading of the Greek philosophers and participative immersion into their lifeworld. But the historical in Heidegger supersedes this initiative in full measure, since assigning the pre-Socratics to the First Beginning, and Plato and Aristotle to the end of the First Beginning, forces one to place other relevant doctrines in consciously specified semantic contexts. Heidegger sees the "Greek" and "first beginning" elements in the pre-Socratics on the basis of his reconstruction of the history of philosophy, that is, through performing ontological destruction. Therefore, he also anxiously discarded everything among the Greeks that seemed to him to be "non-

Greek" (eastern or oriental – which is clearly evident in his Greece travel journal). In the exact same way, he takes that which does not fall under the "first beginning" among the pre-Socratics (for example, some expressions from Anaximander's fragments in the likes of the pair of terms γένεσις and φθορά) and attributes such to later contaminations [3]. Furthermore, everything in Platonism which does not fall under his understanding of "finiteness in the First Beginning" – which encompasses no more nor less than the whole scope of "open Platonism", such as apophatism, the super-essence of the Good in the Republic and the One in Parmenides [4] – is subject to the same censuring. In any case, the level of Heidegger's self-reflection was so high and transparent that his understanding of the contemporal moment is unprecedented in the profundity of his generalizations of the structure of this moment, which were the most penetrating and convincing (even if their formulation involved his resorting to a certain hermeneutical censorship), and his attempts to immerse himself in Ancient Greek thought were the most successful and authentic among all analogous initiatives.

The phenomenology of philosophy (unlike phenomenological philosophy) proposes that we completely opt out of hermeneutic procedures which presume some starting position (even as a basis for comparison). In clearly accounting for ourselves in the structure of the contemporal moment, in its modernist/postmodernist historial and its Eurocentrism, and in approaching a philosopher or philosophical school separated by time or space from this observatory point, we must effect a radical change in our phenomenological position; we must completely relocate ourselves to a new observatory point where the lifeworld of the person we are studying is situated and from which his ideas and contemplation came. If a philosopher says something about "eternity", "heaven", "immortality", "God", or "angels", it follows that such should be understood not in terms of what we know about "time", the "atmosphere", the "vacuum", the "death of God", or the "naive ridiculousness of faith in angels", but on the grounds of how this philosopher himself understood, lived, and perceived that of which he speaks. Any discourse on eternity from a human who credibly and absolutely knows (the contemporal moment) that there is no nor can there be any "eternity", will be perceived either as an allegory, a hyper-exaggerated image, a metaphor, or as a sign without meaning, an empty set. In such a case, one lifeworld (the contemporal) is acting as a judge, prosecutor, and accuser (this is the original meaning of the Greek word διάβολος) of another lifeworld by denying it the right to defend its phenomenological grounds that are completely usurped by contemporality. If we are capable of logically assessing the arbitrariness of such a loaded approach (explainable through the Nietzschean will to power or Heideggerian Gestell), then the distance from the contemporal moment will take shape on its own, and this means that we are breaking from it and acquiring the ability to embark on a genuine philosophical journey from one observatory point to another observatory point.

The anthropology of philosophy

The case of the anthropology of philosophy is almost the same as that of anthropology. The school of philosophical anthropology of Max Scheler, Arnold Gehlen, etc., took its roots from Kant's remarks on the anthropological essence of thinking – which can be considered a new formulation of the sophist Protagoras' maxim that "man is the measure of all things" – a standpoint which was embedded in the language of modernity. However, philosophical anthropology, as a typical product of the contemporaneous moment, has nothing in common with the anthropology of philosophy. The anthropology of philosophy proceeds from the plurality of human societies and the diversity of their structures as meaningful outside of any hierarchies or subordinations. Man is a plural phenomenon, anthropology (or at least new anthropology) argues, and the societies built by him reflect this essential plurality which can be studied by comparing them, but they cannot be categorically defined on a quantitative scale of primitive/superior, developed/underdeveloped, rational/irrational, savage/civilized, childish/naive/adultly serious and rigorous. A human belonging to a "primitive" (archaic) society and a human formed in a modern, highly-differentiated society (again, the contemporaneous moment) are both people in a full sense, and their differences are not amenable to hierarchization into greater/lesser, higher/lower, better/worse. It cannot be said that red is "better" than yellow or that savory is "tastier" than sweet, just as it is impossible to argue that larks are "more perfect" than foxes or whales "more perfect" than sharks. Anthropology draws attention to man as a matrix of the society he creates. Once the structure of a human is different, then societies will reflect these differences and repeatedly refract them in the play of reflections, shadows, and flares.

By applying this principle to philosophy – something which anthropologists and even philosophical anthropologists virtually never do – we acquire a myriad of contemporaneous moments containing historico-geographical (historico-cultural) positions proper to different philosophers, each of which moments should be studied in their internal logic, harmony, symmetry, and by placing the position of the scholar (and his contemporaneous moment) in brackets. This approach is the qualification of the anthropologist who studies different (archaic) societies and is obliged for the sake of such to operate with a maximally possible pure experience of understanding culture. At the same time, he must obviously, consciously forbid himself from permitting any projections of his own culture and any hierarchizations or hastily drawn systems of correspondences. But anthropologists deal mainly with cultures that are non-literate and have poorly developed systems of rational self-reflection (Lévy-Bruhl's principle of "mystical complicity"). Myth, ritual, symbol, sacred rite, and initiation by definition deny transparent rationalization. Hence, the open (emphatic) position of anthropologists is considered here to be at once applicable and justified by the difficulty (or impossibility) of establishing precise correspondences between a rational set and set of para-rational (which does not mean "irrational" or "sub-rational" as were so convinced the 19th century evolutionist anthropologists before Boas and Lévy-Strauss). This principle has not been applied to philosophy insofar as it has been believed that transitioning to a rational system means leaving the sphere of the "para-rational" and the implicit (the mythological, symbolic, and mystical) and entering the sphere of universal self-reflection, where such anthropological operations become irrelevant. Thus, from an anthropological point of view, we are affirming a "measure of things" not simply of man, but of modern Western man, and we are assigning the philosophy which

has guided this modern Western man the status of a universal algorithm allowing for the interpretation of all other philosophical systems, both non-modern and non-Western. In the study of archaic cultures, such anthropological suprematism (=cultural racism) was categorically rejected for humanistic, ethical, and scientific reasons. But in the sphere of philosophy, it has been implicitly preserved intact and not subjected to any critical reflection. The modern Western philosopher measures all philosophy (ancient and non-Western as well as modern Western) proceeding from the criteria of the absolute superiority of modern Western philosophy as the cumulative telos for all other systems. At the heart of this lies a mono-polar anthropology based in implicit racism.

At first glance, the impression might be had that applying anthropological methodology to philosophy takes us back to a state of naivety and contradicts the methodology of destruction/deconstruction. This is not so. Deconstruction might very well be an excellent propaedeutic for the anthropology of philosophy since it studies in detail the structure of the context in which this or that philosophical system was created or this or that philosopher thought. If we ignore deconstruction, we miss the most important point of language and the semantic structures of the grammatical field in which a particular philosophy is situated. But by including deconstruction as a method, we must simultaneously subject the contemporaneous moment itself to deconstruction, i.e., deconstruct that which produces deconstruction, which means once again standing at a distance from the observatory point. Deconstruction forbids naively reading a philosopher without indicating his context and semantic ties. This is the force and significance of deconstruction. But in establishing such context and such links, he who engages in deconstruction is in turn operating with the algorithm of the teleological historial which only allows one to order the field of a text. The historial itself is necessary for deconstruction, and the clearer it is realized, the more reliable the result of a deconstruction. But two positions are permissible to take with regards to the historial: one can be under its suggestive, interpretive influence, i.e., be under it, or one can take a certain distance in relation to it, and apply deconstructive reflection and a particular apperception to it. The second case is an invitation to stand above the historial or outside of it. By not curtailing deconstruction in favor of “new naivety”, and by in parallel with this deconstructing the one engaged in deconstructing, we reach the field of the anthropological method in philosophy. In exploring the philosophy of any philosopher and placing it in a well defined context (deconstruction), we should simultaneously perceive such as something open, excluding from our methodology everything that we know with regards to the future and the past vis-a-vis the observatory point in which the philosopher under study is situated. By knowing in advance the end of the play, we unwittingly apply this knowledge to its first acts. It is this which prevents us from genuinely enjoying the action and turns us from participants in the action into the audience or, in the best case, actors ourselves. What truly delights us is the acting of the actors who force us to forget about how the performance will end and who immerse us in the tension of the dramatic moment. Only in this moment, when we seriously begin to believe that the events in the spectacle might actually go quite differently from what we might know from having repeatedly read the script or seen the production, can we talk about any full effect accomplished. The theater becomes what it originally was – an action, a mystery, a transformative act. This is an open theater, a play whose outcome is known neither by the director, the actors, nor, of course, the viewers.

Applying this metaphor to philosophy, he who carries out deconstruction without deconstructing himself and his actions, can be likened to a person who knows the script well and, over the course of the spectacle, obsessively narrates to his neighbor what is happening and how it will end. Sometimes the skeptical and all-knowing expressions of the audience are enough to simply break the spell of theatrical magic. Such annoying companions are capable of nullifying all the drama of the production. Thus, the principle of the “open theater”, in which the content of the drama at its peak breaks away from the rigid frameworks of the script, can be applied to the open history of philosophy based on the anthropological method. If we knowingly rule out that a philosopher whom we are studying might mean something other than what we know of him in identifying his place in the paradigm of the historical, we render ourselves unfit for a real meeting with him. Yet for some reason we dare to describe this weakness of our own spirit as indicating superiority, greater universality of our position, or in accordance with the rules of ethnocentrism and cultural racism. In behaving so, we forbid ourselves from being surprised, and this means we make ourselves completely unfit for philosophy.

Conversely, in applying the anthropological principle to philosophy, we immediately find ourselves in a complex, saturated, and unpredictable world where surprise can seize us at every turn. This is the open philosophy of history, which a priori recognizes the anthropological dignity of all thinkers, none of whom are considered below us, our contemporaneous moment, or our observatory point regardless of whether it is modern and Western or non-modern and non-Western. The most consistent representatives of postmodern philosophy are moving in this direction as long as they do not stray from this path towards particularities, towards fascination with minor and obsessive details of liberation strategies which in one way or another retain an inertial connection to the arterial tendency of Modernity's historical, that tendency which has exerted its teleological (anthropologically racist) influence on Post-Modernity in proposing liberation from the details, but remaining in slavery to the overall picture.

Untergang

Before moving on to Traditionalism as the third strategy for attaining distance from the contemporaneous moment, it is worth dwelling on how Martin Heidegger, the key figure in the clarification of the historical, understood the vector of time in its *Seinsgeschichtliche* dimension. Heidegger can be seen as a transitional element between those who recognized the indispensability of the contemporaneous moment in the spirit of Western European philosophy, and the Traditionalists who, on the contrary, as we will see a little later, offered their version of finding the desired distance. The fact is that Heidegger, recognizing the fatality of time confronting the present and the centrality of the West as the birthplace and place of development of the Logos, deciphered the trajectory of time as “descent”, *Untergang*, “decline”, “flight of the gods”, and as the “abandonment of being” (*Seinsverlassenheit*). Herein lies the fundamental

difference between Heidegger and the majority of philosophers of Modernity and Post-Modernity who, on the contrary and as a rule, treated history as ascent, accumulation, discovery, and movement forwards and upwards. For Heidegger, the contemporal moment is the point of Midnight towards which we are heading from the evening. He decoded the history of philosophy as a process of descent, decline, concealment, immersion, and oblivion. Thus, his philosophy is profoundly tragic, and its eschatology is paradoxical, for at the moment of maximal darkness, Dasein is supposed to remember its Seyn-Being and decipher the pain of its absence as Gottesnacht, "the night of the gods", as a call to realize Ereignis, "the Event." Heidegger saw the telos in the moment of Midnight, in the very center of which the sacrament of Dasein switching its mode of existing from the inauthentic to the authentic must be accomplished.

Such a dualistic attitude towards the contemporal moment as a lower threshold, intended as the point from which begins (or should begin) the return, is, however, problematic, as such is not guaranteed. The return might not begin and, at any rate, such presupposes a perspective opposite to that of the historial which inspired Heidegger's love for Greek thought and his striving to live and think it along with the very creators of the First Beginning of philosophy. Imagining himself as the one completing Seynsgeschichte, Heidegger felt a deep yearning for those who began such. Thus, distance from the contemporal moment was conquered in parallel to phenomenological destruction, without cancelling or replacing it.

The case of Heidegger is unique in many respects, but what interests us in this situation is that the Beginning of philosophy (from the first to the last phase with Plato and Aristotle) in his specific model of the historial is conceived as a philosophical chord followed by descent, Untergang, which leads to the present, and not vice versa as a "childish" and "long-overcome" phase of philosophy. In this regard, the Ancient Greeks and in particular the pre-Socratics are exalted to unattainable heights. As follows, comprehending them is possible only by degree of radically distancing ourselves from the present through the elevation, the "return", the επιστροφή of the Neoplatonists.

Heidegger distinguishes the Untergang from those who realize themselves in it and see it for what it truly is – the Untergang. One can be simply fascinated by the flow of history, and one can clearly and penetratingly realize that the movement of the historial is a fall into the abyss. Those who recognize time as falling, Heidegger calls "the descending", the Untergehende. They, unlike all others, descend consciously, clearly perceiving their endeavor without illusions or fears, although not without horror. For them, the Untergang is the Untergang; they see descent as descent, while all others, not being the "descending", the Untergehenden, can feed themselves with illusions and methodically rise to the luring and guaranteed horizon of "progress."

Such an interpretation of the historical as *Untergang* converges Heidegger with the Traditionalists, whose methods we will now examine.

Traditionalism

The philosophy of Traditionalism [5], otherwise termed *Philosophia Perennis* or “perennialism”, is of colossal significance to our topic. First established and formulated by René Guénon, this philosophy, as correctly noted by René Alleau, can be considered alongside Marxism the “most revolutionary trend in modern philosophy” [6]. If we approach Traditionalism with due scrutiny, we will soon realize that this comparison with Marxism, albeit paradoxical at first glance, is absolutely justified. The Traditionalists’ appraisal of values is, in a whole number of parameters, far more radical, revolutionary, and uncompromising than the ideas of Marx (as well as those of the other “philosophers of suspicion” among whom Nietzsche and Freud are usually numbered).

Of importance to us at the present moment is how Traditionalism helps establish distance with regards to the contemporal moment and, accordingly, why we have distinguished it as an independent strategy. The very structure of Traditionalist philosophy is in many respects close to that of Heidegger’s, insofar as historical time is understood as a downward movement, degradation, a path to the bottom. The Traditionalists extracted this from religious doctrines and myths (including even from the monotheistic religions), as well as from their analysis of the ontological transformations and changes in the state of the cosmos. However, unlike Heidegger, in Traditionalism the scale of degradation takes on a much more extensive scope and goes far beyond European philosophy. If for Heidegger history is the thread of the *Logos* stretched between the pre-Socratics and himself as an heir and eschatological figure of German classical philosophy, then for the Traditionalists this period is thought of as only one fragment of descent, of the *Untergang*, amidst more general and fundamental processes.

For Traditionalists, time itself is a fall, or more precisely, a downward spiral. It has ensnared not only the historical European societies known to us, but the entire destiny of mankind, including the societies of the East and those “mythical” epochs from which only the most hazy legends have remained with us (for example, the legends of Hyperborea and Atlantis). Thus, the contemporal moment is conceived by Traditionalists not as a peak or *telos*, but as a zone of extreme degradation, a lie, oblivion, and delusion. It is the end of the road to the abyss, the moment of reaching the bottom. Accordingly, the observatory point at which modern humanity (in the era of Modernity and Post-Modernity) stands is not the top of a mountain, but the bottom of the world pit from which nothing can be seen besides dark phantoms and unwieldy fantasies. We live in a world of philosophical hallucinations in which the worse we see, the

more we flaunt our foresight. Guénon called this the “reign of quantity” and interpreted it as the critical low of spirit.

Accordingly, Traditionalism completely overturns all the proportions assimilated by default by the contemporal moment:

The time in which we live is an era of total poverty and ignorance. If we base ourselves on its “credibility” and “evidences”, it is impossible to correctly decipher the present, let alone the past which was related to more perfect and authentic periods of history.

The West is the cultural field of accelerated degeneration and decline which surpasses other (non-Western) cultures only in the speed of its fall into the abyss.

The distance in relation to the contemporal moment here is maximal: the West and Modernity are thought of as the worst, the sterile, useless, and false which cannot be taken as any kind of reference point for comprehending anything at all. Thus, modern Western philosophy and its axioms are the worst possible philosophy based on ignorance, a wrong decision in its very basic intellectual operations, and completely delusional with regards to nature, the structure of time, space, man, the world, the primordial, the logic of history, the structure of matter, etc. Modern philosophy is arrogant and lofty nonsense. The only way to break through to philosophy lies in absolutely transgressing the foundational paradigms of Modernity and completely overthrowing the dogmas of modern Western culture, science, values, and political and social systems. All of the West and Modernity’s claims to superiority over the past and non-Western societies are completely groundless and unfounded. The modern West is incapable of understanding even its own relatively recent history (the Middle Ages), not to mention Antiquity or the profound, genuine, authentic, and competent philosophies and systems of the East.

In this operation, the observatory point of modern “Western humanity” flies away, and something directly opposite to such is taken as the starting point: Antiquity and the East, which are genuine observatory points and not simulacra. We are proposed henceforth to think against the present and against the West. Thus unfolds a completely different philosophical map on which the vector of authenticity leads not to the contemporal moment, but away from it as if from a black hole, gathering all the more meaningful and enlightening rays the further it is removed from the “center of hell.” The less Western and modern, the more genuine and authentic, the Traditionalists argue. Insofar as degradation is not limited to the West, but has much larger scale boundaries, the distance from the “black point” of reference must be constantly increased. Everything that remotely resembles “modernity” and the West, even in distant periods of history or outside of the European context, must immediately be treated with suspicion. And if we encounter anything similar in philosophy, culture, politics, society, art, etc., then we should be especially careful, for we are likely dealing with things whose trajectory is sharp and rapid fall

into the abyss. The West and modernity are the essence of evil, lies, a dead-end, darkness, madness, violence, suffering, and death. And everything that resembles this, even remotely, by virtue of this very fact is dubious, suspicious, and most likely dangerous.

If modernity denies eternity and invests being in the historical of becoming, this means that only eternity is and represents a reliable basis for understanding the nature of time. There is no vice versa. If modernity insists on space being isotropic, i.e., quantitative, then it is obvious that the truth should be the exact opposite, and the anisotropy and “natural places” of Aristotle determine the structures of “sacred geography” and the laws of climate and the elements. If modernity calls reason and corporeality the unquestionably and prime properties of man, then this is in itself sufficient reason to be sure that the body is insignificant and unbinding, nothing more than “leather garments”, and that reason is nothing more than an empty shadow that has accidentally fallen on the temporary surface from the rays of the true, divine, heavenly mind. If modernity proposes to correlate knowledge with experience, then experience as a measure of the authenticity of science should generally be excluded from consideration, for knowledge is realized through contemplation and based on intellectual intuition which grasps the eidetic essence of things rather than their dead shells and “husks.” And so on and so forth.

In other words, in Traditionalism we acquire an operational and fundamental weapon for realizing the most radical postmodernist strategy. No philosophy is capable of so fundamentally relativizing the contemporaneous moment and exploding the arrogant claims of Modernity and the West to universalism and the teleologicalness of their philosophy. For Traditionalists, the modern Western philosopher is a guaranteed ignoramus or senseless jester, if not a nihilist possessed by infracorporeal entities.

On the other hand, René Guénon’s follower, the Italian Traditionalist Julius Evola, upon developing this line in his book *Ride the Tiger* [7], came to a very interesting point: if we take eternity seriously, that is, as it was understood and experienced by the philosophers and thinkers of traditional society, then all the content of history should also, in some sense, exist forever and simultaneously. As follows in Evola’s development of this thought, “modernity” as we know it today, what we call the “contemporaneous moment”, i.e., “the West + Modernity”, should have been present at previous stages as well. In other words, the modern world and Tradition can be considered not in diachronic order, in which Modernity replaces Tradition over the course of degradation and descent, but synchronically, where they coexist with one another simultaneously, even in space. Thus, the forms of Tradition, the philosophy of Tradition, and the Logos of Tradition represent Heaven, and the forms of modernity the worlds of hell, the underworld, Hades, and Tartarus.

Man, as the cosmic mediator, is situated on the border between both worlds, between Tradition (above) and modernity (below). He is always straddling this border, eternally, in both the era of Tradition's predominance, and in the periods in which modernity temporarily wins. In his eidetic, eternal dimension, man himself is this border, and the movement of his spirit, his thought, his ways and methods of philosophizing, outline the content of that which lies on either side. Through his choice of orientation, spiritual or corporeal, man constitutes the time, the epoch, the age in which he lives.

Thus, residing in the "dark age", the Kali-Yuga, is neither a fatality, a punishment, nor something arbitrary, but the Night's testing of the grain of eternity, of the divine center that comprises the essence of man. In other words, no matter how far away the Golden Age might be, a kernel of it remains within man as hope, as opportunity, as a fulcrum, which can always be found in refusing to unconditionally and fatalistically (or unconsciously) accept the conditions of the Iron Age. Time is an illusion. The historical is no more than a sign, a metaphor that can be deciphered in different ways and appealed to freely. We ourselves choose the time in which we live. And if man is born in the modern world and in the West's zone of influence, this means that he is included in the profound plans of eternity, and this reflects his mission and fate. Modernity is in Tradition, and Tradition is in modernity. But in different sections of the vertical world, their proportions adjust to being polar: in Heaven (Tradition) there is only a drop of hell (the Biblical serpent that first appeared in paradise), and in hell there is a drop of Heaven. But this is enough to stretch a semantic thread of sacred history, or *hiérophistoire* (in Henry Corbin's formulation) between these drops.

Thus, Traditionalism offers such a radical revolution in relation to the contemporaneous moment, which opens up not only the possibility of establishing the desired distance in one direction, but makes available a whole world of mountain peaks consisting of possible observatory points to be sought in Antiquity and in the East, in traditional society and in religious teachings, everywhere and among all, except the modern West and its philosophers. It bears admission that such an open and substantial philosophical perspective cannot but inspire. It proposes to discover what we ourselves have closed, to dive without skepticism and distrust of religion into ancient philosophy, mythology, traditions and beliefs, both those close (European) and distant (Asian). It is tantamount to a proposal to tear off the blindfold covering our eyes which, contrary to the assurances of false doctors, are fully capable of seeing the light and contemplating a world imbued with eidetic, sagacious rays.

We have thus prepared the basis for our further study into the structures and versions of the Logos. We have outlined what in our vision is the field upon which the main strategies of Noomachy, the wars of the mind, should take place. We have relativized the contemporaneous moment while leaving the possibility for periodically referencing it with the aim of clarifying its ontological content, its place in the overall construct of the different Logos worlds which we will explore along different axes – both vertical and horizontal, moving freely through times (eons) and spaces (layers of being).

In accord with Tradition, the primordial source, the quintessence, the center of all that is the Mind, the *voũç* of the Neoplatonists, the *boddhi* of the Buddhists, the Mind is eternal and contains everything at once. This means that it also contains us who think of it, and the world that has unfolded before It (before us) in the process of thinking about it. The world exists to the extent that it is conceived by the Mind. But the Mind, containing everything in itself, also encompasses contradictions, conflicts, falls, and descent. It contains modernity as well. Therefore, upon having rejected and undermined modernity at the very outset of our study, we must also find the latter's rightful place in it. Truth can truly judge not only truth, but also lies, as well as that which lies between truth and lie: the opinion (*δῶξα*). Thus, the roots of war, tragedy, catastrophe, and problems must be sought within the Mind. In the Mind must be sought the meaning of the night of the gods and the secret of their flight that comprises the essence of modernity. But it is impossible to participate in the Mind and not be involved in the wars which It wages, which are waged within it. We cannot move towards the Logos and remain indifferent to its internal tensions, its splits and its amalgamations.

Philosophy is a mobilization to the front of the spirit. Resolute and irrevocable. We will devote ourselves and one another to such over the course of the unfolding of our book's subject matter.

Footnotes:

[1] See paragraph six, "Die Aufgabe einer Destruktion der Geschichte der Ontologie", in Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2006), p. 19.

[2] Jacques Derrida, *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1967).

[3] Martin Heidegger, *Holzwege* (Frankfurt a. M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1972), p. 296.

[4] See Aleksandr Dugin, *V poiskakh temnogo Logosa* (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2013).

[5] See Aleksandr Dugin, *Filosofiia traditsionalizma* (Moscow: Arktogeya-tsentr, 2002).

[6] René Alleau, De Marx a Guénon: d'une critique «radicale» à une critique «principielle» de sociétés modernes in Les Dossiers H. René Guénon (Paris: L'Âge d'Homme), p. 193.

[7] Julius Evola, Cavalcare la tigre: Orientamenti esistenziali per un'epoca di dissoluzione (Rome: Edizioni Mediterranee, 2008).

Deconstructing the “Contemporal Moment”: New Horizons in the History of Philosophy

April 11, 2018

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 1 of Noomakhia: Voyny Uma – Tri Logosa: Apollon, Dionis, Kibela (Noomakhia: Wars of the Mind – Three Logoi: Apollo, Dionysus, Cybele) (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2014).

The contemporal moment: destruction/deconstruction

It is obvious that the history of philosophy must be studied by determining a starting point beforehand. It seems a matter of course that we would automatically take such to be the contemporal moment. The contemporal moment means the “here and now”, *hic et nunc*. This moment acts as our starting position, as our “observatory point” from which we can survey philosophy as the history of philosophy. The history of philosophy thus unfolds in our direction, towards us. This concerns both time and place: philosophy is historically situated between its “sources” (for example, the pre-Socratics) and the situation in the 21st century (in its philosophical self-reflection). As a rule, this temporal vector is more or less reflexive, hence why the main (axial) discipline in all sectors of philosophy is the history of philosophy. By virtue of fixating on this historico-philosophical vector, we acquire the possibility to be involved in this process, to consolidate our own position as that of a “philosopher” in a historico-philosophical structure. This is the *nunc*, the “now”, the temporal sector in which our thinking is placed, if it wants to be “philosophical.”

Hence follows the rather important conclusion that was fully drawn between Heidegger and his call for “phenomenological destruction” in *Sein und Zeit* [1], and Jacques Derrida who developed this thesis into the methodology of “deconstruction” [2]. The history of philosophy, according to Heidegger, is tethered in his case to ontology, to the question of being, and, thereby being an onto-history, *Seynsgeschichtliche*, is a continuity of stages at each of which the question of being is treated uniquely. As follows, the history of philosophy is a logical structure or a series of logical structures which can be more or less described in ontological terms which in turn determine the place and significance of a philosophy or

philosophical school in the overall historico-philosophical process. Determining a philosopher or school's place in this continuity, which has strict temporal and cultural frameworks (from the pre-Socratics to Nietzsche to Heidegger himself), is equivalent to correctly understanding their philosophy and, accordingly, allows for the meaning of such to be revealed. This is ontological destruction – the placement of a philosopher or philosophical tendency through the revelation of the fundamental paradigm of their ontological positions (often hidden, veiled, or implicit) in a strictly notional sequence:

The First Beginning (pre-Socratics) -> The End of the First Beginning (Plato and Aristotle) -> the middle – the Middle Ages (Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, etc.) -> The Beginning of the End – New Time (modernity – Descartes, Leibniz, and up to Kant) -> The End of the End (Hegel and Nietzsche).

Destruction is the placement of a philosopher into this sequence in order to reveal his place in the history of philosophy, and thus the meaning of his philosophizing.

For Jacques Derrida, the history of philosophy is a text, the structure of which is determined by the intersections of semantic lines. This is a view which more or less repeats, albeit in nuanced and detailed form, Heidegger's axial construction. Thus, for both Heidegger and Derrida, it is important to place a philosopher in the context in which the semantics of his constructs are found to represent quotations, polemics, or the overturning or reproduction of the discourses that are at disposal before and around him in the "grammatological fabric." In this case, deconstruction is the attentive inspection of this fabric's patterns, in which any "authorship" is conceived as no more than a locus of quotations compiled in an ordered manner. Philosophy, thus, is one field of connotation, and its history comprises changes in the predominant connotative matrices and interpretive algorithms. Between Heidegger and Derrida, we can place Michel Foucault and his epistemology.

Of course, such hermeneutical models of the history of philosophy distinctly crystallized around the end of the 20th century. In the 19th century, and earlier, the "contemporal moment" was described in other terms. For Kant, it was paired with the revelation of the structures of "transcendental reason", for Hegel such was the "end of history" and the "objective spirit." For Nietzsche, there was the maximization of the will to power in the figure of the Übermensch. In Marx, there was the horizon of the world proletarian revolution. In all cases, philosophy has been conceived exclusively as a teleological process – whether by those who have tried to give this teleology fixed forms, or those who, on the contrary, have understood history as the accumulation of a "quantity" of individual freedom (Stirner, Bergson or von Hayek/Popper).

For all of these teleologies – both the naive ones of the 19th century and those 20th century theories based on critical reflection, structuralism, and phenomenological corrections (as well as the philosophy of language and psychoanalysis) – the “contemporal moment” serves as an “observatory point”, and he who stands at this observatory point and has considered the content of the moment itself and its structures (no matter who this “someone” might be – the subject, Dasein, a rhizome, a deciphering system, a “body without organs”, a hermeneutic) is the key to the history of philosophy capable of interpreting it in relation to themselves. This is very important, since in such a perspective any preceding “contemporal moment” is conceived as a “preliminary”, “unfinished”, “incomplete” one compared to the current contemporal moment and, as follows, the nunc cannot be adequately described prius, as it does not convert into the past the “contemporality” of the present. In a certain sense, this is history as such, and the history of philosophy is the philosophical conceptualization of its structure.

The French philosopher Henry Corbin used the neologism *historial* in order to translate the meaning of Heidegger’s expression *Seynsgeschichtliche* (“onto-historical”) into French. The *historial* is the structure of the “contemporal moment” which predetermines its content as a teleological vector whose tip points to the nunc and presumes its beginning in the embryonic formation of the Logos.

In one way or another, any attempt to conceptualize the moments in the history of philosophy (of individual philosophers or their schools) beyond the *historial*, i.e., without deconstruction taking into account such explicit and convincing reflections (phenomenology, Heidegger, Post-Modernity), will look not simply naive, but ludicrous. In the context of the *historial*, any attempt to read Plato or Hegel outside of their notional sequence, which was in one way or another noted by philosophers in the last quarter of the 20th century, would mean falling into the self-deceit of unreflexive and unstructured quoting with a guaranteed loss of semantic links. If a reading of this or that philosopher does not flow in the context of this historico-philosophical grille de la lecture, i.e., without a thorough review of this observatory point where it is situated – or, in other words, on the other end of destruction/deconstruction operations – then nonsense is guaranteed. Not a single expression, not a single review, not a single intellectual procedure stands a chance at being correctly conceptualized, and instead of philosophy and the history of philosophy, we are left with the “white noise” of gloomy cognition, a simulacrum of thinking.

This is first and foremost the case with the nunc, the *historial*, or the temporal aspect of philosophy. The matter stands somewhat differently with the spatial aspect, the *hic*.

The topos of the present: the West as a spatial telos

The contemporal moment is situated not only in a temporal sequence, but also in space, on a scale of synchronic territory. If modern philosophy has devoted enormous, if not all of its attention to the first aspect of the contemporal moment, then spatiality has been left outside of the sphere of interests. Western philosophy is wholly and completely "tempo-centric." Consequently, in it Sein is bound to Zeit, and this bondage is absolute, as a result of which Raum, or space, is studied merely as a residual principle, as an accident. Kant placed space closer to the object; Descartes altogether identified the object with "extense" (res extensa) in contrast to the subject (res cogens). In new European philosophy, thought is the property of the subject; consequently, time is the basis of philosophy and its context. Hence the historial as a measure.

It is telling that even critiques of the structuralists' historico-philosophical understanding have by almost no means whatsoever addressed the fate of space in philosophy and philosophical self-reflection. The principle of "spatiality" has been integrated in the form of a synchronic topology intended to serve as a semantic scale for interpreting the content of time. In other words, structuralist topology only serves the historial in the spirit of the Heideggerian sequence or Derrida's grammatological field.

But if we upset the habitual frameworks of new European philosophy and nevertheless pose the question of "where?" with regards to the observatory point, and if we fix the hic in the famous expression hic et nunc, then we have a specific civilizational concept of the West. The West in this case strictly fulfills the same teleological function as the "now." The contemporal moment is situated in the West, and is the point towards which all the rays of possible thinking converge, thus achieving their epiphany in none other than the West. The West is the birthplace of the Logos; the Logos is itself in the "evening land", Hesper, Abendland. This was more or less obvious for the cultural ethnocentrism of the Greeks. It was the core of the Romans' legal and political self-consciousness, and it became the axis of ecumenism. Then it was incarnated in the concept of universal progress in modernity. It remains the main driving force of the processes of globalization.

Husserl spoke of "European humanity" as a philosophical quintessence of the human as such. Heidegger directly and explicitly equated philosophy with Europe.

The West is the telos of earthly space just as the present is the telos of the past. Thus, "modern" philosophy can only be Western philosophy, and just as the present is the essence of the past, so is the Western the essence of the non-Western. Between nunc and hic there is thus present a direct analogy: time (the historial, or Karl Jaspers' axial time) convenes in the "now" and space in the "here", interpreted as "here in the West." And in precisely the same way that the past is conceived as the not-yet-present, so is the non-Western (for example, the eastern) thought of as the not-yet-Western.

This Western European, spatio-teleological character of the contemporal moment is conceptualized much less distinctly than the historial and the structures of the history of philosophy. Unlike the paramount discipline that is philosophy which deals with the deconstruction of time, spatial correctives and schematizations are the prerogative of the applied, secondary, and even barely institutionalized sciences with weakly developed philosophical apparatuses, such as geopolitics or international relations. On a more serious level, only the first attempts have been made at relativizing the Eurocentrism of modern philosophy as such, as with Edward Said's introduction of the notion of "orientalism" or the more foundational but not so generalized studies of cultural, social, and structural anthropology.

It is none other than the West for which the absolutization of time and radical tempo-centrism are characteristic. In reducing the historial to a structure, something constructed, and departing from the present, we automatically produce a concentric model of civilizational space in which the West is situated in the center and all the rest of humanity is in the periphery.

Just as attempting to read this or that philosopher in isolation from the historial (without deconstruction and, consequently, beyond the contemporal grille de la lecture) is today philosophical nonsense, the same status is held by all those attempts at substantiating the relevance of non-Western forms of philosophy – in the best cases, they can be examined as extravaganza, and in the worst as obtrusive attempts by ignoramuses to force themselves upon a scientific problem on equal terms with the opinion of a scholar. What can a not-yet-Logos tell a Logos that the Logos itself does not know?

Thus we have ascertained the structure of the contemporal moment as analyzed from a temporal and spatial point of view.

Post-Modernity and distance

In the structure of post-modern philosophy, the historial is subject to steadfast analysis, and at times this attention is so detailed that the spatial aspect and characteristic Eurocentrism of Western philosophy also come into view. Combined with an anthropological approach, this yields definite preconditions for not only recognizing the structure of the observatory point as such, but also establishing a certain distance from it. The intensive reflections of post-Heideggerian (post-modern) philosophy on the nature of time, and the first glimpses into conceptualizing the spatial situation of contemporality bring us to an entirely new horizon and radically deeper level of philosophical self-

reflection. What if the very observatory point from which we survey the history of philosophy, and from departing which we engage in deconstruction, is in turn nothing more than a “philosophical construct?” In other words, to what extent is the very idea of the teleology of the present moment qualified, and as follows, is tempo-centrism justified? Is the historial that serves us as a reliable tool for interpreting philosophy in turn an ephemeral and non-historical paradigm projected into the present which is not cumulative-teleological (regarding content), but arbitrary or arranged in accordance with a mechanism different from the vector of “axial time?” Finally, is the West the “only place” of the Logos, the zone towards which converge the rays of consciousness, or is this only one of many spatial receptacles of thinking alongside others? Does this mean that Eurocentrism is justified at its heart, and does it not follow that we should look for other, uniquely fully-fledged and complete dialects of the Logos?

These suspicions, of course, are left in the periphery of the philosophy of Post-Modernity, in the shadow of more habitual, inertial trends which, although are enriched, detailed, and introspective procedures, perpetuate the “dogmatic” vector of classical Western rationalism. Post-Modernity usually justifies and substantiates itself with routine practices of the contemporal moment, but the post-modern attitude nevertheless makes such suspicions and conjectures wholly natural. This inspires among those most of all worried about the possibility of breaking with the traditions of Western Modernity rather natural concerns: will Post-Modernity not altogether lead to the liquidation of the fulcra of the Western European Logos as such? If distance from the contemporal moment itself might be, even if only theoretically, justifiable, then all the claims of Western European humanity to universality immediately crumble, and this means no more nor less than the collapse of the Logos. Heidegger clearly recognized this prospect and posited that, nonetheless, the West’s teleology and contemporal moment, exposed to nihilistic catastrophe, should and could be overcome only through this moment and only in the West. This proposal consisted not in retreating from the observatory point, but in deepening the bottomless of its fall in order to, in this dramatic collapse, discover the mystery of its meaning and soar up to thrust forth Another Beginning for philosophy. Heidegger deliberately interpreted the shadow unleashed by Post-Modernity as a refusal of the burden of the “difficult knowledge of nihilism.” The decline of Europe, according to Heidegger, is the decline of being itself, and it should be experienced as such.

In post-Heideggerian philosophy, Heidegger’s tragism and heroism were rather quickly adapted into the routine of the new methodology; the anti-technological call to recognize the bottomless nothingness of such in turn became a technology. But postmodernism, albeit vapid and dubious, perhaps even by virtue of its refusal to sink deeper into the dizzying passivity of desperate Heideggerian nihilism, and at the same time not being in any position to turn Dasein’s mode of existence into authenticity (denying the Decision, *Entscheidung*), nevertheless slightly opened up the possibility for a step in this direction. If the Logos of the West, as far as one can tell, did not accept the Heideggerian invitation to implode, to explode in its own night, then in the very least it dissipated into bits of postmodern miasma and prepared for the last figure of dissolution. The fixation of distance with regards to the moment of contemporality and the clear and intelligible understanding of its “arbitrariness” (in spatial and temporal

senses) is already the *fait accompli* end of the West, its philosophical end. For those for whom the *telos* of the historical was the only permissible “lifeworld”, this meant the “end of everything.” But here is where the most significant aspect manifests itself: what if the historical, with its fundamental tempo-centrism and concomitant Eurocentrism, with the structure of its Logos and grating deconstruction/ontological destruction, is but one among numerous and equivalent possibilities for reasonably organizing the world? If this is so, then the finale experienced by Western philosophy is no more than an episode in a more complex and multipolar philosophical picture where there might be multiple observatory points and multiple understandings of time, space, and Logos.

Post-Modernity as a whole, of course, does not gravitate in this direction, remaining as it has under the wonted hypnosis of its Eurocentric contemporality, but the distance in question here becomes an open possibility with the dissipation of the European Logos. In Post-Modernity, the structures of this Logos become so blurred and scattered, so unintelligible and weak, that breaking with their suggestiveness turns out to be an extremely easy endeavor. That the strength of this Logos’ inertia is such that the clutch of its impact on the people of the West themselves does not let up even when the nature of rationality itself withers and dissipates in front of their very eyes – that is another matter altogether. The ends no longer come together and liberation from dogma leads to liberation from the process of liberation by virtue of which the subject itself evaporates – after all, Post-Modernity recognizes not only God, but man himself as an “apparatus of suppression”, a “repressive machine”, and thus the freedom of man transforms into freedom from man. This is the logical result. It is a paradox, but today higher humanism means dehumanization or transhumanization. Tragedy thus imperceptibly slips into farce.

Simply stepping away from the observatory point becomes a simple endeavor only for those capable of digressing from the residual hypnosis of the historical, which means that it is by no means simple. Nonetheless, the philosophical space for this has been prepared, and if the distance which we have been discussing is taken as the object of our heightened attention, then we can rather easily differentiate a spectrum of philosophical procedures with which we can feel out a different fulcrum or even a whole constellation of such fulcra in order to, departing from it/them, observe and subject the contemporaneous moment to deconstruction, thus demolishing the ponderability of temporal and spatial teleology, i.e., the Western Logos’ claims to exclusivity.

Hence the proposal to move in the direction of this new distance and new fulcra, and let the dead bury their dead.

The phenomenology of philosophy as a method

How can this distance be embodied in philosophical practice? Theoretically, the most principled manner is to escape the hypnosis of the contemporal moment, to calmly and with complete self-control refuse the pressure posed by both the historial (the trajectory of the history of philosophy towards the point at which we find ourselves on the scale of historical temporality) and Eurocentrism. To this end, philosophy can be seized through several strategies:

the phenomenological

the anthropological

the Traditionalist

Surely there are other ways by which to resolve this issue, but for now we limit ourselves to these three trajectories. Let us begin with phenomenology. The phenomenologist philosophers, setting before themselves the goal of clarifying the structure of the processes of logical thinking at the first stage, that preceding the engagement of properly logical (in the spirit of Aristotle) procedures of reasoning, transitioned from revealing the nature of intentionality (Brentano) to the concepts of noesis or noema and the "lifeworld" (Husserl). This line was picked up and developed in a particularly original manner by early Heidegger, as a result of which he arrived at Dasein. Phenomenology proposes that we focus our attention on studying the structures of thinking in their pre-logical phases, when consciousness "naively" and "uncritically" operates with its own "representations" (Vorstellungen), by substituting the objects themselves theoretically outside of the subject with the corresponding noema inhabiting consciousness. This logic is constructed upon ascertaining the obvious (evidential) ostensibility of the object, thus as a matter of course accomplishing the step of transcendentalizing. At the heart of this process lies phenomenality itself, on which consciousness usually does not fixate as it instantly flies above this level. However, in phenomenologists' opinion, it is none other than this phenomenality which is the most authentic and evidential state, and all other procedures of consciousness, including rational logic, are built on top of such with a greater or lesser degree of self-reflection. Thus, in order to achieve a precise and scientifically credible tracing of the basic processes of gnosiology on which thinking, logic, philosophy and science are built, it is necessary to intentionally study the phenomenal level which affects all other stages, hiding under their complexity and thereby dimming clear representations of nature and basic trajectories of thought.

The phenomenological method has been borrowed by the most diverse humanitarian disciplines from sociology to anthropology and psychology. Everywhere where it has been employed, the point has been explaining the arrangement and mechanisms of those structures on a level lesser and more primordial than that of logical thinking. Heidegger constructed his existential analytics on this basis.

In the field of the history of religions, the phenomenological method was actively used by Henry Corbin, who argued that religious doctrines cannot be understood on the grounds of purely, rationally formulated theological dogma and doctrines or by ignoring the inner experience of religious life. It is precisely studying this experience, which may very well contradict our ideas about the structure of the real, possible, and actual, that only can and should construe more complex religious systems. If we ignore this “lifeworld” of the religious person, then our understanding of religious doctrine will be superficial and completely incorrect. After all, we would miss the main and most essential foundation, that upon which such doctrine is built and whose structures it produces (whether revealing or, on the contrary, veiling them). Therefore, Corbin, who studied Islamic mysticism and Iranian Shi’ism in particular, emphasized that in order to understand religion, one must learn to live it from within. Hence why, in some passages, Corbin, himself a Protestant, wrote “we, Shiites” and believed that without such methodological identification with the sphere under study, without such immersion into the phenomenology of religious experience, no reliable judgement concerning the religion under study is possible.

Franz Boas’ cultural anthropology and Claude Lévi-Strauss’ structural anthropology call for studying archaic societies in a similar manner. Archaic man lives in a phenomenal world qualitatively different from the one in which the man of European Modernity lives. They differ not only on the level of development of logical thinking (as the sociologist and ethnologist Lucien Lévy-Bruhl tried to demonstrate), but in the profoundly different organization of the world of phenomena, including taxonomies, the allocation of basic entities, symmetries, and classifications. Lévi-Strauss argued that in archaic tribes and non-literate cultures we are dealing not with a pre-logical type of thinking, but with a different kind of logic that is no less developed than that of European people in Modernity, but is structured around different algorithms and thereby yields different results and gnosiological/ontological systems.

In sociology, an analogous method was employed by Husserl’s student, Alfred Schütz, who proposed to study society by abstracting oneself from the sum of our a priori knowledge of such and any notions of the purported “objectivity” of existing (non-existing) objects of the outside world and their autonomous significance. Different societies, in Schütz’s understanding, operate with different “lifeworld” structures; as follows, they construct different phenomenological systems which at the next stage determine their views of reality, whether internal, external, subjective, objective, etc. Analogous methods were applied by Harold Garfinkel, the founder of “ethnomethodology” who, like Schütz, focused his attention on the “horizons of everyday life” and “practices of everyday life.”

But here is what is interesting: phenomenology as such originally took shape as a philosophical current and was only later applied to other sciences – the phenomenological method was not applied to philosophy itself. Phenomenologist philosophers themselves based their theories on the contemporary

moment and, moreover, considered phenomenology to be a more precise and reflective expression of contemporality itself. In its historical movement along the path of scientific process and with its increasing refinement of the methodology of its logical thinking, at one point "European humanity" (Husserl) began developing the sphere of philosophy not in breadth (extensively), but in depth (intensively). This was largely because the expansion of reason had reached its natural borders. This deeper plunge into reason itself is not a step back on the path of singular process in raising the general level of rationality, but a step forward allowing to make those spheres which had previously evaded the arranging and authority of logical procedures into objects of rational attention. Albeit with significant corrections, Heidegger's philosophy was built in this vein. Philosophical phenomenology, thus, is not only not equivalent to the phenomenology of philosophy, but altogether does not imply the possibility of the latter.

Nevertheless, by making a reverse circle and moving through phenomenological sociology, anthropology, ethnology, and the phenomenology of religion, we can try to apply the phenomenological method to philosophy itself by employing a method opposite to that of deconstruction that reveals the structure of the historical. This is an invitation to perceive this or that philosophical system outside of the context of the history of philosophy, outside of the context of our knowledge about the structure of time, history, reality, the subject and object, and outside of ontology, which we have erected on the basis of the contemporal moment (whether consciously or by inertia). In other words, the phenomenology of philosophy offers the possibility of authentically experiencing the phenomenological basis at the heart of a concrete philosophical Logos, which is taken as a reliable contemporal moment only at a distance from the contemporal moment which constitutes the structure of our philosophical "I." Thus, an anthropologist immerses himself in the life of an archaic tribe in order to understand its language, its senses, and beliefs from within this life itself, from the experience of being within the tribe, and not from the grounds of superficial comparison with terms, things, practices, meanings, and beliefs which he knows from his personal experience of belonging to modern Western civilization. Since Boas, and especially under the influence of Lévi-Strauss, only field studies grounded in the method of "participant observation", empathy, and immersion in the phenomenology of the lifeworld of an archaic tribe are considered anthropologically credible. The phenomenology of philosophy should be constructed in a similar way: in order to understand how this or that philosopher thought, it is necessary to trace his thought from the lifeworld to the logical formulation of thought on the high level of logical expression. But this is possible only at a distance from the contemporal moment and its fundamental content, i.e., through the procedure of removing the philosophical identity of the phenomenologist of philosophy. In Heidegger we can see attempts at such a reading of the Greek philosophers and participative immersion into their lifeworld. But the historical in Heidegger supersedes this initiative in full measure, since assigning the pre-Socratics to the First Beginning, and Plato and Aristotle to the end of the First Beginning, forces one to place other relevant doctrines in consciously specified semantic contexts. Heidegger sees the "Greek" and "first beginning" elements in the pre-Socratics on the basis of his reconstruction of the history of philosophy, that is, through performing ontological destruction. Therefore, he also anxiously discarded everything among the Greeks that seemed to him to be "non-

Greek" (eastern or oriental – which is clearly evident in his Greece travel journal). In the exact same way, he takes that which does not fall under the "first beginning" among the pre-Socratics (for example, some expressions from Anaximander's fragments in the likes of the pair of terms γένεσις and φθορά) and attributes such to later contaminations [3]. Furthermore, everything in Platonism which does not fall under his understanding of "finiteness in the First Beginning" – which encompasses no more nor less than the whole scope of "open Platonism", such as apophatism, the super-essence of the Good in the Republic and the One in Parmenides [4] – is subject to the same censuring. In any case, the level of Heidegger's self-reflection was so high and transparent that his understanding of the contemporal moment is unprecedented in the profundity of his generalizations of the structure of this moment, which were the most penetrating and convincing (even if their formulation involved his resorting to a certain hermeneutical censorship), and his attempts to immerse himself in Ancient Greek thought were the most successful and authentic among all analogous initiatives.

The phenomenology of philosophy (unlike phenomenological philosophy) proposes that we completely opt out of hermeneutic procedures which presume some starting position (even as a basis for comparison). In clearly accounting for ourselves in the structure of the contemporal moment, in its modernist/postmodernist historial and its Eurocentrism, and in approaching a philosopher or philosophical school separated by time or space from this observatory point, we must effect a radical change in our phenomenological position; we must completely relocate ourselves to a new observatory point where the lifeworld of the person we are studying is situated and from which his ideas and contemplation came. If a philosopher says something about "eternity", "heaven", "immortality", "God", or "angels", it follows that such should be understood not in terms of what we know about "time", the "atmosphere", the "vacuum", the "death of God", or the "naive ridiculousness of faith in angels", but on the grounds of how this philosopher himself understood, lived, and perceived that of which he speaks. Any discourse on eternity from a human who credibly and absolutely knows (the contemporal moment) that there is no nor can there be any "eternity", will be perceived either as an allegory, a hyper-exaggerated image, a metaphor, or as a sign without meaning, an empty set. In such a case, one lifeworld (the contemporal) is acting as a judge, prosecutor, and accuser (this is the original meaning of the Greek word διάβολος) of another lifeworld by denying it the right to defend its phenomenological grounds that are completely usurped by contemporality. If we are capable of logically assessing the arbitrariness of such a loaded approach (explainable through the Nietzschean will to power or Heideggerian Gestell), then the distance from the contemporal moment will take shape on its own, and this means that we are breaking from it and acquiring the ability to embark on a genuine philosophical journey from one observatory point to another observatory point.

The anthropology of philosophy

The case of the anthropology of philosophy is almost the same as that of anthropology. The school of philosophical anthropology of Max Scheler, Arnold Gehlen, etc., took its roots from Kant's remarks on the anthropological essence of thinking – which can be considered a new formulation of the sophist Protagoras' maxim that "man is the measure of all things" – a standpoint which was embedded in the language of modernity. However, philosophical anthropology, as a typical product of the contemporaneous moment, has nothing in common with the anthropology of philosophy. The anthropology of philosophy proceeds from the plurality of human societies and the diversity of their structures as meaningful outside of any hierarchies or subordinations. Man is a plural phenomenon, anthropology (or at least new anthropology) argues, and the societies built by him reflect this essential plurality which can be studied by comparing them, but they cannot be categorically defined on a quantitative scale of primitive/superior, developed/underdeveloped, rational/irrational, savage/civilized, childish/naive/adultly serious and rigorous. A human belonging to a "primitive" (archaic) society and a human formed in a modern, highly-differentiated society (again, the contemporaneous moment) are both people in a full sense, and their differences are not amenable to hierarchization into greater/lesser, higher/lower, better/worse. It cannot be said that red is "better" than yellow or that savory is "tastier" than sweet, just as it is impossible to argue that larks are "more perfect" than foxes or whales "more perfect" than sharks. Anthropology draws attention to man as a matrix of the society he creates. Once the structure of a human is different, then societies will reflect these differences and repeatedly refract them in the play of reflections, shadows, and flares.

By applying this principle to philosophy – something which anthropologists and even philosophical anthropologists virtually never do – we acquire a myriad of contemporaneous moments containing historico-geographical (historico-cultural) positions proper to different philosophers, each of which moments should be studied in their internal logic, harmony, symmetry, and by placing the position of the scholar (and his contemporaneous moment) in brackets. This approach is the qualification of the anthropologist who studies different (archaic) societies and is obliged for the sake of such to operate with a maximally possible pure experience of understanding culture. At the same time, he must obviously, consciously forbid himself from permitting any projections of his own culture and any hierarchizations or hastily drawn systems of correspondences. But anthropologists deal mainly with cultures that are non-literate and have poorly developed systems of rational self-reflection (Lévy-Bruhl's principle of "mystical complicity"). Myth, ritual, symbol, sacred rite, and initiation by definition deny transparent rationalization. Hence, the open (emphatic) position of anthropologists is considered here to be at once applicable and justified by the difficulty (or impossibility) of establishing precise correspondences between a rational set and set of para-rational (which does not mean "irrational" or "sub-rational" as were so convinced the 19th century evolutionist anthropologists before Boas and Lévy-Strauss). This principle has not been applied to philosophy insofar as it has been believed that transitioning to a rational system means leaving the sphere of the "para-rational" and the implicit (the mythological, symbolic, and mystical) and entering the sphere of universal self-reflection, where such anthropological operations become irrelevant. Thus, from an anthropological point of view, we are affirming a "measure of things" not simply of man, but of modern Western man, and we are assigning the philosophy which

has guided this modern Western man the status of a universal algorithm allowing for the interpretation of all other philosophical systems, both non-modern and non-Western. In the study of archaic cultures, such anthropological suprematism (=cultural racism) was categorically rejected for humanistic, ethical, and scientific reasons. But in the sphere of philosophy, it has been implicitly preserved intact and not subjected to any critical reflection. The modern Western philosopher measures all philosophy (ancient and non-Western as well as modern Western) proceeding from the criteria of the absolute superiority of modern Western philosophy as the cumulative telos for all other systems. At the heart of this lies a mono-polar anthropology based in implicit racism.

At first glance, the impression might be had that applying anthropological methodology to philosophy takes us back to a state of naivety and contradicts the methodology of destruction/deconstruction. This is not so. Deconstruction might very well be an excellent propaedeutic for the anthropology of philosophy since it studies in detail the structure of the context in which this or that philosophical system was created or this or that philosopher thought. If we ignore deconstruction, we miss the most important point of language and the semantic structures of the grammatical field in which a particular philosophy is situated. But by including deconstruction as a method, we must simultaneously subject the contemporaneous moment itself to deconstruction, i.e., deconstruct that which produces deconstruction, which means once again standing at a distance from the observatory point. Deconstruction forbids naively reading a philosopher without indicating his context and semantic ties. This is the force and significance of deconstruction. But in establishing such context and such links, he who engages in deconstruction is in turn operating with the algorithm of the teleological historial which only allows one to order the field of a text. The historial itself is necessary for deconstruction, and the clearer it is realized, the more reliable the result of a deconstruction. But two positions are permissible to take with regards to the historial: one can be under its suggestive, interpretive influence, i.e., be under it, or one can take a certain distance in relation to it, and apply deconstructive reflection and a particular apperception to it. The second case is an invitation to stand above the historial or outside of it. By not curtailing deconstruction in favor of “new naivety”, and by in parallel with this deconstructing the one engaged in deconstructing, we reach the field of the anthropological method in philosophy. In exploring the philosophy of any philosopher and placing it in a well defined context (deconstruction), we should simultaneously perceive such as something open, excluding from our methodology everything that we know with regards to the future and the past vis-a-vis the observatory point in which the philosopher under study is situated. By knowing in advance the end of the play, we unwittingly apply this knowledge to its first acts. It is this which prevents us from genuinely enjoying the action and turns us from participants in the action into the audience or, in the best case, actors ourselves. What truly delights us is the acting of the actors who force us to forget about how the performance will end and who immerse us in the tension of the dramatic moment. Only in this moment, when we seriously begin to believe that the events in the spectacle might actually go quite differently from what we might know from having repeatedly read the script or seen the production, can we talk about any full effect accomplished. The theater becomes what it originally was – an action, a mystery, a transformative act. This is an open theater, a play whose outcome is known neither by the director, the actors, nor, of course, the viewers.

Applying this metaphor to philosophy, he who carries out deconstruction without deconstructing himself and his actions, can be likened to a person who knows the script well and, over the course of the spectacle, obsessively narrates to his neighbor what is happening and how it will end. Sometimes the skeptical and all-knowing expressions of the audience are enough to simply break the spell of theatrical magic. Such annoying companions are capable of nullifying all the drama of the production. Thus, the principle of the “open theater”, in which the content of the drama at its peak breaks away from the rigid frameworks of the script, can be applied to the open history of philosophy based on the anthropological method. If we knowingly rule out that a philosopher whom we are studying might mean something other than what we know of him in identifying his place in the paradigm of the historical, we render ourselves unfit for a real meeting with him. Yet for some reason we dare to describe this weakness of our own spirit as indicating superiority, greater universality of our position, or in accordance with the rules of ethnocentrism and cultural racism. In behaving so, we forbid ourselves from being surprised, and this means we make ourselves completely unfit for philosophy.

Conversely, in applying the anthropological principle to philosophy, we immediately find ourselves in a complex, saturated, and unpredictable world where surprise can seize us at every turn. This is the open philosophy of history, which a priori recognizes the anthropological dignity of all thinkers, none of whom are considered below us, our contemporaneous moment, or our observatory point regardless of whether it is modern and Western or non-modern and non-Western. The most consistent representatives of postmodern philosophy are moving in this direction as long as they do not stray from this path towards particularities, towards fascination with minor and obsessive details of liberation strategies which in one way or another retain an inertial connection to the arterial tendency of Modernity's historical, that tendency which has exerted its teleological (anthropologically racist) influence on Post-Modernity in proposing liberation from the details, but remaining in slavery to the overall picture.

Untergang

Before moving on to Traditionalism as the third strategy for attaining distance from the contemporaneous moment, it is worth dwelling on how Martin Heidegger, the key figure in the clarification of the historical, understood the vector of time in its *Seinsgeschichtliche* dimension. Heidegger can be seen as a transitional element between those who recognized the indispensability of the contemporaneous moment in the spirit of Western European philosophy, and the Traditionalists who, on the contrary, as we will see a little later, offered their version of finding the desired distance. The fact is that Heidegger, recognizing the fatality of time confronting the present and the centrality of the West as the birthplace and place of development of the Logos, deciphered the trajectory of time as “descent”, *Untergang*, “decline”, “flight of the gods”, and as the “abandonment of being” (*Seinsverlassenheit*). Herein lies the fundamental

difference between Heidegger and the majority of philosophers of Modernity and Post-Modernity who, on the contrary and as a rule, treated history as ascent, accumulation, discovery, and movement forwards and upwards. For Heidegger, the contemporal moment is the point of Midnight towards which we are heading from the evening. He decoded the history of philosophy as a process of descent, decline, concealment, immersion, and oblivion. Thus, his philosophy is profoundly tragic, and its eschatology is paradoxical, for at the moment of maximal darkness, Dasein is supposed to remember its Seyn-Being and decipher the pain of its absence as Gottesnacht, "the night of the gods", as a call to realize Ereignis, "the Event." Heidegger saw the telos in the moment of Midnight, in the very center of which the sacrament of Dasein switching its mode of existing from the inauthentic to the authentic must be accomplished.

Such a dualistic attitude towards the contemporal moment as a lower threshold, intended as the point from which begins (or should begin) the return, is, however, problematic, as such is not guaranteed. The return might not begin and, at any rate, such presupposes a perspective opposite to that of the historial which inspired Heidegger's love for Greek thought and his striving to live and think it along with the very creators of the First Beginning of philosophy. Imagining himself as the one completing Seynsgeschichte, Heidegger felt a deep yearning for those who began such. Thus, distance from the contemporal moment was conquered in parallel to phenomenological destruction, without cancelling or replacing it.

The case of Heidegger is unique in many respects, but what interests us in this situation is that the Beginning of philosophy (from the first to the last phase with Plato and Aristotle) in his specific model of the historial is conceived as a philosophical chord followed by descent, Untergang, which leads to the present, and not vice versa as a "childish" and "long-overcome" phase of philosophy. In this regard, the Ancient Greeks and in particular the pre-Socratics are exalted to unattainable heights. As follows, comprehending them is possible only by degree of radically distancing ourselves from the present through the elevation, the "return", the επιστροφή of the Neoplatonists.

Heidegger distinguishes the Untergang from those who realize themselves in it and see it for what it truly is – the Untergang. One can be simply fascinated by the flow of history, and one can clearly and penetratingly realize that the movement of the historial is a fall into the abyss. Those who recognize time as falling, Heidegger calls "the descending", the Untergehende. They, unlike all others, descend consciously, clearly perceiving their endeavor without illusions or fears, although not without horror. For them, the Untergang is the Untergang; they see descent as descent, while all others, not being the "descending", the Untergehenden, can feed themselves with illusions and methodically rise to the luring and guaranteed horizon of "progress."

Such an interpretation of the historical as *Untergang* converges Heidegger with the Traditionalists, whose methods we will now examine.

Traditionalism

The philosophy of Traditionalism [5], otherwise termed *Philosophia Perennis* or “perennialism”, is of colossal significance to our topic. First established and formulated by René Guénon, this philosophy, as correctly noted by René Alleau, can be considered alongside Marxism the “most revolutionary trend in modern philosophy” [6]. If we approach Traditionalism with due scrutiny, we will soon realize that this comparison with Marxism, albeit paradoxical at first glance, is absolutely justified. The Traditionalists’ appraisal of values is, in a whole number of parameters, far more radical, revolutionary, and uncompromising than the ideas of Marx (as well as those of the other “philosophers of suspicion” among whom Nietzsche and Freud are usually numbered).

Of importance to us at the present moment is how Traditionalism helps establish distance with regards to the contemporal moment and, accordingly, why we have distinguished it as an independent strategy. The very structure of Traditionalist philosophy is in many respects close to that of Heidegger’s, insofar as historical time is understood as a downward movement, degradation, a path to the bottom. The Traditionalists extracted this from religious doctrines and myths (including even from the monotheistic religions), as well as from their analysis of the ontological transformations and changes in the state of the cosmos. However, unlike Heidegger, in Traditionalism the scale of degradation takes on a much more extensive scope and goes far beyond European philosophy. If for Heidegger history is the thread of the *Logos* stretched between the pre-Socratics and himself as an heir and eschatological figure of German classical philosophy, then for the Traditionalists this period is thought of as only one fragment of descent, of the *Untergang*, amidst more general and fundamental processes.

For Traditionalists, time itself is a fall, or more precisely, a downward spiral. It has ensnared not only the historical European societies known to us, but the entire destiny of mankind, including the societies of the East and those “mythical” epochs from which only the most hazy legends have remained with us (for example, the legends of Hyperborea and Atlantis). Thus, the contemporal moment is conceived by Traditionalists not as a peak or *telos*, but as a zone of extreme degradation, a lie, oblivion, and delusion. It is the end of the road to the abyss, the moment of reaching the bottom. Accordingly, the observatory point at which modern humanity (in the era of Modernity and Post-Modernity) stands is not the top of a mountain, but the bottom of the world pit from which nothing can be seen besides dark phantoms and unwieldy fantasies. We live in a world of philosophical hallucinations in which the worse we see, the

more we flaunt our foresight. Guénon called this the “reign of quantity” and interpreted it as the critical low of spirit.

Accordingly, Traditionalism completely overturns all the proportions assimilated by default by the contemporal moment:

The time in which we live is an era of total poverty and ignorance. If we base ourselves on its “credibility” and “evidences”, it is impossible to correctly decipher the present, let alone the past which was related to more perfect and authentic periods of history.

The West is the cultural field of accelerated degeneration and decline which surpasses other (non-Western) cultures only in the speed of its fall into the abyss.

The distance in relation to the contemporal moment here is maximal: the West and Modernity are thought of as the worst, the sterile, useless, and false which cannot be taken as any kind of reference point for comprehending anything at all. Thus, modern Western philosophy and its axioms are the worst possible philosophy based on ignorance, a wrong decision in its very basic intellectual operations, and completely delusional with regards to nature, the structure of time, space, man, the world, the primordial, the logic of history, the structure of matter, etc. Modern philosophy is arrogant and lofty nonsense. The only way to break through to philosophy lies in absolutely transgressing the foundational paradigms of Modernity and completely overthrowing the dogmas of modern Western culture, science, values, and political and social systems. All of the West and Modernity’s claims to superiority over the past and non-Western societies are completely groundless and unfounded. The modern West is incapable of understanding even its own relatively recent history (the Middle Ages), not to mention Antiquity or the profound, genuine, authentic, and competent philosophies and systems of the East.

In this operation, the observatory point of modern “Western humanity” flies away, and something directly opposite to such is taken as the starting point: Antiquity and the East, which are genuine observatory points and not simulacra. We are proposed henceforth to think against the present and against the West. Thus unfolds a completely different philosophical map on which the vector of authenticity leads not to the contemporal moment, but away from it as if from a black hole, gathering all the more meaningful and enlightening rays the further it is removed from the “center of hell.” The less Western and modern, the more genuine and authentic, the Traditionalists argue. Insofar as degradation is not limited to the West, but has much larger scale boundaries, the distance from the “black point” of reference must be constantly increased. Everything that remotely resembles “modernity” and the West, even in distant periods of history or outside of the European context, must immediately be treated with suspicion. And if we encounter anything similar in philosophy, culture, politics, society, art, etc., then we should be especially careful, for we are likely dealing with things whose trajectory is sharp and rapid fall

into the abyss. The West and modernity are the essence of evil, lies, a dead-end, darkness, madness, violence, suffering, and death. And everything that resembles this, even remotely, by virtue of this very fact is dubious, suspicious, and most likely dangerous.

If modernity denies eternity and invests being in the historical of becoming, this means that only eternity is and represents a reliable basis for understanding the nature of time. There is no vice versa. If modernity insists on space being isotropic, i.e., quantitative, then it is obvious that the truth should be the exact opposite, and the anisotropy and “natural places” of Aristotle determine the structures of “sacred geography” and the laws of climate and the elements. If modernity calls reason and corporeality the unquestionably and prime properties of man, then this is in itself sufficient reason to be sure that the body is insignificant and unbinding, nothing more than “leather garments”, and that reason is nothing more than an empty shadow that has accidentally fallen on the temporary surface from the rays of the true, divine, heavenly mind. If modernity proposes to correlate knowledge with experience, then experience as a measure of the authenticity of science should generally be excluded from consideration, for knowledge is realized through contemplation and based on intellectual intuition which grasps the eidetic essence of things rather than their dead shells and “husks.” And so on and so forth.

In other words, in Traditionalism we acquire an operational and fundamental weapon for realizing the most radical postmodernist strategy. No philosophy is capable of so fundamentally relativizing the contemporaneous moment and exploding the arrogant claims of Modernity and the West to universalism and the teleologicalness of their philosophy. For Traditionalists, the modern Western philosopher is a guaranteed ignoramus or senseless jester, if not a nihilist possessed by infracorporeal entities.

On the other hand, René Guénon’s follower, the Italian Traditionalist Julius Evola, upon developing this line in his book *Ride the Tiger* [7], came to a very interesting point: if we take eternity seriously, that is, as it was understood and experienced by the philosophers and thinkers of traditional society, then all the content of history should also, in some sense, exist forever and simultaneously. As follows in Evola’s development of this thought, “modernity” as we know it today, what we call the “contemporaneous moment”, i.e., “the West + Modernity”, should have been present at previous stages as well. In other words, the modern world and Tradition can be considered not in diachronic order, in which Modernity replaces Tradition over the course of degradation and descent, but synchronically, where they coexist with one another simultaneously, even in space. Thus, the forms of Tradition, the philosophy of Tradition, and the Logos of Tradition represent Heaven, and the forms of modernity the worlds of hell, the underworld, Hades, and Tartarus.

Man, as the cosmic mediator, is situated on the border between both worlds, between Tradition (above) and modernity (below). He is always straddling this border, eternally, in both the era of Tradition's predominance, and in the periods in which modernity temporarily wins. In his eidetic, eternal dimension, man himself is this border, and the movement of his spirit, his thought, his ways and methods of philosophizing, outline the content of that which lies on either side. Through his choice of orientation, spiritual or corporeal, man constitutes the time, the epoch, the age in which he lives.

Thus, residing in the "dark age", the Kali-Yuga, is neither a fatality, a punishment, nor something arbitrary, but the Night's testing of the grain of eternity, of the divine center that comprises the essence of man. In other words, no matter how far away the Golden Age might be, a kernel of it remains within man as hope, as opportunity, as a fulcrum, which can always be found in refusing to unconditionally and fatalistically (or unconsciously) accept the conditions of the Iron Age. Time is an illusion. The historical is no more than a sign, a metaphor that can be deciphered in different ways and appealed to freely. We ourselves choose the time in which we live. And if man is born in the modern world and in the West's zone of influence, this means that he is included in the profound plans of eternity, and this reflects his mission and fate. Modernity is in Tradition, and Tradition is in modernity. But in different sections of the vertical world, their proportions adjust to being polar: in Heaven (Tradition) there is only a drop of hell (the Biblical serpent that first appeared in paradise), and in hell there is a drop of Heaven. But this is enough to stretch a semantic thread of sacred history, or *hiérophistoire* (in Henry Corbin's formulation) between these drops.

Thus, Traditionalism offers such a radical revolution in relation to the contemporaneous moment, which opens up not only the possibility of establishing the desired distance in one direction, but makes available a whole world of mountain peaks consisting of possible observatory points to be sought in Antiquity and in the East, in traditional society and in religious teachings, everywhere and among all, except the modern West and its philosophers. It bears admission that such an open and substantial philosophical perspective cannot but inspire. It proposes to discover what we ourselves have closed, to dive without skepticism and distrust of religion into ancient philosophy, mythology, traditions and beliefs, both those close (European) and distant (Asian). It is tantamount to a proposal to tear off the blindfold covering our eyes which, contrary to the assurances of false doctors, are fully capable of seeing the light and contemplating a world imbued with eidetic, sagacious rays.

We have thus prepared the basis for our further study into the structures and versions of the Logos. We have outlined what in our vision is the field upon which the main strategies of Noomachy, the wars of the mind, should take place. We have relativized the contemporaneous moment while leaving the possibility for periodically referencing it with the aim of clarifying its ontological content, its place in the overall construct of the different Logos worlds which we will explore along different axes – both vertical and horizontal, moving freely through times (eons) and spaces (layers of being).

In accord with Tradition, the primordial source, the quintessence, the center of all that is the Mind, the νοῦς of the Neoplatonists, the bodhi of the Buddhists, the Mind is eternal and contains everything at once. This means that it also contains us who think of it, and the world that has unfolded before It (before us) in the process of thinking about it. The world exists to the extent that it is conceived by the Mind. But the Mind, containing everything in itself, also encompasses contradictions, conflicts, falls, and descent. It contains modernity as well. Therefore, upon having rejected and undermined modernity at the very outset of our study, we must also find the latter's rightful place in it. Truth can truly judge not only truth, but also lies, as well as that which lies between truth and lie: the opinion (δόξα). Thus, the roots of war, tragedy, catastrophe, and problems must be sought within the Mind. In the Mind must be sought the meaning of the night of the gods and the secret of their flight that comprises the essence of modernity. But it is impossible to participate in the Mind and not be involved in the wars which It wages, which are waged within it. We cannot move towards the Logos and remain indifferent to its internal tensions, its splits and its amalgamations.

Philosophy is a mobilization to the front of the spirit. Resolute and irrevocable. We will devote ourselves and one another to such over the course of the unfolding of our book's subject matter.

Footnotes:

[1] See paragraph six, "Die Aufgabe einer Destruktion der Geschichte der Ontologie", in Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2006), p. 19.

[2] Jacques Derrida, *De la grammatologie* (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit, 1967).

[3] Martin Heidegger, *Holzwege* (Frankfurt a. M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1972), p. 296.

[4] See Aleksandr Dugin, *V poiskakh temnogo Logosa* (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2013).

[5] See Aleksandr Dugin, *Filosofiia traditsionalizma* (Moscow: Arktogeya-tsentr, 2002).

[6] René Alleau, De Marx a Guénon: d'une critique «radicale» à une critique «principielle» de sociétés modernes in Les Dossiers H. René Guénon (Paris: L'Âge d'Homme), p. 193.

[7] Julius Evola, Cavalcare la tigre: Orientamenti esistenziali per un'epoca di dissoluzione (Rome: Edizioni Mediterranee, 2008).

dugin and "the jews"

Foreword

It is worth looking at the sort of people Dugin has actually invited to join the leadership Council of his "Eurasia Movement," while he is delivering his fantastic essays and lectures (1) on the end of the world (2) and similar cosmic themes. The two Israeli Jews Dugin has invited to join the Council, who are presented in the latter part of this chapter, are exploiting race and religion for generically right-wing imperialist purposes which might equally be those of the CIA or of the FSB. There is a professional type of member of the Black International whose loyalties must necessarily be to one or another of the great imperialist blocs of his time, but who is quite incapable of actually believing in the apocalyptic, eschatological fantasies which Dugin puts forward to mass audiences. An example of the type of agent I have in mind, a top-ranking member of the Black International with a half-century history of going back and forth at will between neo-Nazism and NATO, is Stefano della Chiaie, whose multifarious intelligence links are explored in Stuart Christie's "Portrait of a Black Terrorist" (3). Dugin's Jewish Israeli recruits are not quite in that class, but they are clearly 'operatives', and they both dismiss Dugin's flirtations with Iran, Venezuela and other Israeli enemies as irrelevant to their own affiliation with "Eurasia". Indeed, these flirtations are irrelevant, since they are nothing but window-dressing. This could equally be true of Dugin's 'anti-Americanism'. After all, the CIA has always been happy to employ right-wing activists whose writings are full of 'anti-Americanism'. The secret to this is that the CIA case officers pretend to agree with them that the USA would be much improved by a fascist coup. This sordid underworld of 'operatives', of course, is in complete contrast to Dugin's outwardly respectful attitude to Putin, and to the Russian Orthodox Church. On the Eurasia.info website (4), Dugin appears to be following Putin's petit-bourgeois line very assiduously. But he continues to expand his metaphysical vision, to attract the idealists, currently along apparently Heideggerian-Guenonian lines. He is careful not to defend Israel openly, or even to mention it.

What I offer below is, first of all, one of Dugin's characteristically brilliant essays which is not widely known or generally available, but can be found in the Internet Archive (the 'Wayback Machine'). URLs for all the texts are at the end of this essay. In "The Jews and Eurasia", Dugin uses a dialectical technique which I would describe as 'juggling'. Broadly speaking, he groups the European Jews of the modern world into two opposing psychological and cultural camps, in order to create the hopeful illusion in the minds of non-Jewish readers of an eschatological, mystical bent that Jewish 'messianism' converges with Christian 'messianism' in a universalistic way, which it in reality does not. This essay is highly illuminating if you read it with some knowledge of what Jewish 'messianism' is actually all about, and rather than offer various fragmentary texts to illustrate this, I shall recommend that you watch this brief youtube video (5) to gain an inside understanding of the actuality. There is no resemblance, indeed there is an antithesis, between Jewish 'messianism' and 'messianism' in the Christian sense of the word. This antithesis is illustrated pretty clearly by the two Israeli Jews Dugin has invited to join his Council, Avram Shmulevich and Avigdor Eskin, who are presented below, following Dugin's wonderful dialectical fantasy. The general type of Israeli Jew who is most likely to feature in Russian life is the Lubavitcher or

‘Chabadnik’. Lubavitch could be described as ‘Messianic’, but their ‘Messianism’ has nothing at all in common with that of the Russian Christian, except possibly its extreme right-wing orientation, which has made Lubavitch into a useful adjunct to the CIA over the decades. But Dugin’s own recruits, Shmulevich and Eskin, are far to the right even of Lubavitch. They are, in fact, Kachists. This may mean that they are too loopy to be useful as agents of influence to imperial intelligence services, or it may not.

EXCERPTS FROM ‘THE JEWS AND EURASIA’

Alexander Dugin, Polyarni Israil (Polar Israel), Feb 2000 (6)

Previously published by Arktogaia. Translated from Russian by M Conserva.

1. Insufficiency of the explanatory schemes

The Jewish question continues to excite the minds of our contemporaries. This issue cannot be solved neither by artificially overlooking it, nor by some hasty apologetic shrill, nor by primitive Judeophobia. The Jewish people is a unique phenomenon in the world history. They clearly follow an absolutely special religious-ethical path, peculiar only to themselves, carrying out through the millennia a mysterious and ambiguous mission. What is the sense of this mission? How to solve the enigma of the Jews? In what consists the so much gossip-raising Mission des Juifs? The theme is too vast to make an attempt at dealing with it in full. Therefore we shall limit ourselves to the role of the Jews in Russian history of the 20th century, since this question painfully touches a very large set of people, irrespective of the ideological camp they belong to. We shall immediately notice that today there is no convincing, completely satisfactory treatment of this theme.

First version: Some historians are generally inclined to deny the relevance of the Jewish factor in Russian and Soviet history, which means doing rough violence to truth. One must only look at the lists of surnames among the main Bolshevik figures and the political elite of the Soviet State, and the disproportionate quantity of Jewish names will catch the eye. To ignore this fact, getting off cheaply with meaningless statements, is incorrect even from the purely scientific, historical point of view.

Second version: This theory concerning the function of the Jews in Russia (USSR) in the 20th century is typical of our national-patriotic circles. Here the role of the Jews is represented as having been only negative, subversive, destructive. It is the famous theory of the «Jewish conspiracy», which was especially popular among the Black Hundreds and later the White-Guardist circles. From this point of view, the Jews, following their unique ethno-religious tradition and considering themselves as a single community revealing a messianic status, consciously organized the destructive Bolshevik movement,

held in it a dominating position and brought to pieces the last stronghold of conservative Christian statehood, culture and tradition. Diehard conservative Judeophobes transfer the same pattern also to the destruction of the USSR, laying this blame too on the Jews, referring to the huge number of representatives of this nation among the ranks of the reformers. The weakness of this concept is that the same people are simultaneously charged with creating the Soviet State and then shattering it, with being the main bearer of the socialist, anti-bourgeois conception, and then with acting as the main apologist of capitalism. Besides, an unbiased acquaintance of the fates of the Bolshevik Jews proves their absolutely sincere belief in the communist ideology, up to being ready to sacrifice their own life for it, which would be impossible, should we seriously accept the version about a group of «cynical and false saboteurs». As a whole, such anti-Semitic version is unconvincing, though it is a little bit closer to the truth than the former, as unlike the former, it recognizes the uniqueness of the Jews' role in the historical process. Curiously enough, such acknowledgement unites the anti-Semites to the most conscious and consequent Zionists.

Third version: This belongs to the Judeophile (in some definite cases, Zionist) circles. They insist that the Jews always and in every case are on the right side, victims of unfair persecutions on the part of various peoples, bearers of all positive, moral, cultural and social values. This position acknowledges the guiding role of the Jews in all the important historical processes in Russia, but obviously states that, either during the Revolution, or during the Soviet history, or during the perestroika, the Jews are the positive pole personifying the eternal truth, kindness, wit, humanity. If for the anti-Semites the Jews act as an unequivocal evil, and this diagnosis is not put into doubt even when it leads to logical and historical absurdities, for the Judeophiles the strictly reverse picture appears: here the Jews are always good, even if this categorically contradicts the objective picture of things. Therefore also this extremely apologetic approach cannot be exhaustive, as it is built from the start on a-priori forced interpretations. Let us remark that both the anti-Semitic and Zionist versions of the issue (the Jews' role in modern Russian-Soviet history) derive from some supposed deep-rooted unity of the Jews, a unity of historical reflection and will. In other words, there appears the tendency to consider the Jews not simply as an ethnos along with the others, but as some kind of organization, party, order, lobby etc. of its own.

2. A new version

A different version, on the contrary, recognizes that there is no unity of the Jews and that, as well as for any other people, each Jew acts in history on his own, from his own «ego», as a personality, which only in a background, minor, psychological sense is defined by ethnic factors, and consequently the term «Hebraism» itself, as both anti-Semites and Zionists understand it, has no right to existence. Leaving aside all these approaches because of their almost evident negativity, we offer here a different version. If we are not satisfied neither with the personalistic approach, nor with the all-encompassing approach – that is, neither with the concept of an indefinite plurality, nor with the concept of a compact unity – it is natural to suspect the existence of some intermediate pattern. It is meaningful to speak about an

internal duality of the Jews, about the presence inside this unique ethnos not of any single will, but of two wills, two «organizations», two «orders», two centres of historical refection, two scenarios of messianic path. Such a dualistic approach will give us a completely new, and in many respects unexpected perspective in the description of this very complex phenomenon. But our starting point in this assumption was due only to a deductive, formal logical method. Let us now verify to what such duality corresponds in reality.

3. Easterners and westerners in the Jewish ranks

The well-known Eurasist author Jacob Bromberg some time ago put forward a very similar idea in the paper «About Jewish Orientalism». His argument was that in the environment of the Russian Jews two antagonistic groups could be clearly distinguished, representing polar psychological and cultural archetypes. One group has a Hassidic-Traditionalist attitude. Its features are mysticism, religious fanaticism, extreme idealism, spirit of sacrifice, profound contempt for the material side of life, for eagerness and for rationalism. In some extreme cases such mystical Jewish type shifts from ethno-religious particularism to universalism, diffusing its own ideals of national Messianism to different peoples. But apart from its orthodox religious environments, the same psychological type gave birth to secularized, fervent revolutionaries, Marxists, Communists, Populists. And one of the branches of mystical Hebraism distinguished itself not simply for its abstract Marxism, but for a deep sympathy and sincere solidarity toward the Russian people, especially to the Russian peasantry and the Russian workers, i.e. with elements not belonging to the official, Czarist Russia, but to the native, parallel Russia, the Russia of soil and land, the Russia of the Old Believers and mystics, the «enchanted Russian pilgrims». Hence the classic types of the Jews: SR (Socialist Revolutionary Party), whose features were always and everywhere an open Russian Nationalist tendency and a consequent and deep-rooted National Bolshevism. Bromberg consolidates this Hassidic-Marxist, mystic-socialist environment into one single group: «Jewish Orientalism». It is the «Eurasist fraction» within Hebraism.

Another celebrated historian, the Soviet Mikhail Agursky, comes to similar conclusions in his epoch-making work «The ideology of National Bolshevism», where he goes to the sources of so the Russophilia so spread in the Jewish revolutionary circles and typical of many figures of Jewish origin among Soviet National Bolshevism — in particular, the greatest ideologists of this current, Isaiah Lezhnev and Vladimir Tan-Bogoraz. Many Jews saw in Bolshevism a possibility to merge, at last, with a large people, to leave the ghetto and their boundaries in order to eschatologically unite Russian Messianism to Jewish Messianism under the common aegis of the Eurasist revolution, of the destruction of the alienating laws of capital and exploitation. Thus, the extreme circles of the mystically oriented East-European Jews (from the Hassids up to Sabbatists) represented a nutritious environment for Bolsheviks, SRs and Marxists, and not incidentally the majority of the Red leaders came from Hassidic families and enclaves wrapped in a mystical, eschatological Messianic pathos. In spite of all the exterior paradoxicality of such rapprochement, some inner typological and psychological connection existed between the Hassidic

types of Jewish fundamentalist and the builders of the atheistic Bolshevik society, since both the former and the latter belonged to the «Eurasist», «Orientalist», mystical-irrationalist part of Hebraism.

The opposite group united in itself a completely different Jewish type: rationalist, bourgeois, cool towards religion but, on the contrary, passionately sinking into the elements of greed, personal benefit, accruing, rationalization of economic activities. This is, according to Bromberg, «Jewish Occidentalism». And again as in the case with Jewish Orientalism, we see here a combination of externally polar positions. On the one hand, to this category belong the religious circles of the extreme Talmudists («Rabbinists»), inheriting the orthodox Maimonidean line, i.e. the Aristotelian-rationalistic line in the Judaic religion. At its times this Talmudic camp actively struggled against the propagation in Hebraism of Kabbalistic, passionately mystical tendencies contradicting the spirit and the mythological form of arid creationist Jewish theology. For more in detail, see the wonderful analysis of this theme in Gershom Scholem: «The Kabbala and its symbolism», «The sources of Kabbalah», etc. Later its leaders sharply reacted against the pseudo-Messiah Sabbatai Zevi, Messianic leader of Jewish mystical heterodoxy. In the 18th and 19th centuries from their environment the party of the so-called «Mitnagedim» (literally the «opponents», in Hebrew) was formed, desperately struggling against Hassidism and the revival of extreme mysticism among the Eastern European Jews. This camp was based on religious rationalism, on Talmudic tradition cleared of any mystical-mythological sedimentations. Strangely enough, to the same category of Jews also belonged the figures of «Haskalah», of the «Jewish Enlightenment», which called for the modernization and secularization of the Jews, refusing religious practices and traditions in the name of «humanism» and «assimilation» to the «progressive peoples of the West». In Russia this Jewish type, though inclined to extreme opposition in relation to the conservative nominally monarchist-Orthodox regime, stood on Western, liberal positions. The top of the expectations of this group was the February Revolution, completely satisfying all their bourgeois, rationalistic and democratic aspirations. After the Bolshevik Revolution, «Jewish Occidentalism» as a whole backed the White side, and despite its racial affinity to the Bolshevik leaders, it did not recognize itself in the universalist and mystic-oriented «Jewish Orientalists».

Just as the Russians were divided during the revolution between «White» and «Red», also on the basis of deep-rooted archetypal features (but this requires a separate discussion), Hebraism too was broken in a political sense, along a deep-rooted line much earlier outlined, in two inter-Jewish camps: Hassidic Kabbalists (Bolsheviks), on the one side, and Talmudist rationalists (Illuminist, bourgeois capitalist) on the other. So, the typology of Bromberg-Agursky based on historical examples reconfirms that conclusion to which we came following a purely logical path: Hebraism, though representing an ethno-religious unity (which is not so obvious yet!), is nevertheless essentially divided in two camps, two «orders», two «communities», two types, which in definite critical situations show not only difference, but also fundamental hostility. Each of these poles has both religious and secular expressions, remaining essentially uniform. «Jewish Orientalism», «Jewish Eurasism» (according to Bromberg) or «Jewish National Bolshevism» (according to Agursky) comprises in itself a religious level — Hassidism, Sabbatism,

Kabbalah — and a secular level — Marxism, revolutionary Socialism, Populism, Bolshevism. «Jewish Occidentalism» also is dual; in it the religious plan coincides with Maimonidean, rationalistic Talmudism (later shown in the Gaons of Vilna, the «Mitnaged» centres, the anti-Hassidic circles), and the secular version is expressed in liberal-democratic, «Enlightened» humanism.

4. Two examples

The fundamental duality we discovered instantly explains a set of factors which remained unclear and paradoxical according to different interpretation methodologies. In particular, a logical explanation is found for the mysterious phenomenon of the so-called «Jewish anti-Semitism». So, Marx's criticism of Lassalle, in which Marx used extremely Judeophobic expressions, and also the considerably anti-Jewish passages in Marx as a whole, identifying Judaism with capitalism, become completely clear, as the Jew Marx from every point of view unambiguously belongs to the mystic-Hassidic, Messianic type, which traditionally sees in bourgeoisie and capitalism — where the relevant role both in philosophical and in common sense is played by the Jews — the main enemy. In his paper «On the Jewish Question», Marx wrote:

What are secular bases of Hebraism? Material needs, self-interest. What is the earthly ideal of the Jew? Selling. Who is his earthly god? Money. Money — here is the zealous deity of Israel. The empirical essence of Hebraism is trade.

Let's notice this underlining of the terms «secular», «empirical». Marx as though hints at two sides. One of them is the material, immanent side, which he, without much ceremony, labels and throws away as the incarnation of negativeness (let us remind of that truly demonic, anti-Christian role, which Marx attributed to Capital). The second side — not secular, not empirical, transcendental. This represents, according to our reconstruction, the Communist-oriented Jewish mysticism. Another example. In its times, a group of Kabbalist Zoharites (admirers of the book «Zohar»), followers of the mystic Kabbalist Jacob Frank, collectively converted to Christianity, contemporarily «exposing» the odious rites of the Talmudists (Rabbinites), primordial enemies. The Jewish historian G L Shtrak in the book «Blood in Beliefs and Superstitions of Mankind» so describes the conflict between the followers of Frank and the Talmudists:

In 1759 they (Frankists) have pronounced to the archbishop Bratislav Lyubensky, that they craved for baptisms, as a deer for a source of water, and tendered to demonstrate «that the Talmudists spill more innocent Christian blood than the pagans, crave for it and use it.» At the same time, they asked him to designate for them dwelling places east of Lemberg, so that they could live there by the work of hands, while «Talmudists cultivate drunkenness, drink the blood of the poor Christians and squeeze them up to

last dime.» Soon after the dispute, under the insistence of the Polish clergy, they accepted baptism for about a thousand Zoharites.

In these two examples we see the unity of spiritual opposition at various levels. The atheist Marx identifies Capital with the figure of the «Jew», and on this basis curses also the Jews and their «empirical deity». Mystical «Frankists» curse the Talmudists on a completely different basis, accusing them — according to the level of the whole polemic — of «drinking the blood of the Christians». It is striking how in the Zoharites the social motive emerges: «Rabbinites squeeze the Christians up to last dime», and Zoharites are going to «to live by the works of hands». The spiritual conflict of mystical mythologists, gnostics, zealots and spiritualists against religious moralists, supporters of pure rite, cult formalists, as though unconsciously and naturally is shifted to the opposition of socialists and capitalists, Bolsheviks and liberal-democrats. In Bromberg's terminology, it is already not difficult at all to identify Marx and Zoharites with «Jewish Orientalism», and capitalists and Rabbinites with the «Occidentalists». Everything converges.

5. Jews against Jews

Now we shall project the outlined scheme on the Soviet history and discover there too the role of the Jews. As a whole, Hebraism on the eve of the revolution was united in its opposition to the existing regime. It concerned both sectors. The Jewish Orientalists were opposed to capitalism and religious conservatism, alienation and formalism in the sphere of culture, craved for a revolutionary change and the opening of the magic aeon of the Messianic kingdom. The Jewish Occidentalists did not accept Czarism for completely different reasons, including its backward, insufficiently capitalist, civilized and humanist regime, subject to perfecting up to the level of the Western civilization. All Hebraism as a whole was in solidarity in the necessity of overthrowing the dynasty, and of the revolution. In it, they found allies both among the nationalist Russian periphery, dreaming about shattering the «prison of the peoples», and among the «left-wing nationalists» from the same Russian environment, perceiving the Romanov-Petersburg regime as an anti-national, anti-patriotic, anti-spiritual parody of the genuine Sacred Rus. Besides, enough Occidentalists were also among the Russian nobility and Russian merchant class actively busy with contemporary Russian capitalism, spoiling the last «cherry gardens» of a quickly degenerating aristocracy. The united action of all these forces, once a favourable situation was present, accomplished the February Revolution. But immediately after it, the unsolved contradictions within the winning camp emerged. After the overthrow of the imperial regime, with a second line of fracture (this time internal) appeared very clearly, and this predetermined all the following events.

After the February Revolution, on the foreground there was an opposition of revolutionary and evolutionary forces, Left-Orientalists and Left-Occidentalists, Eurasists and Europeanists. This fundamental dualism of kinds was very clearly evident also in the Jewish environment itself. The

Bolshevik pole had gathered in itself the representatives of «Jewish Orientalism», the Hassidic-kabbalist kind, Jews-Communists, Jews-Socialists — those, which at the end of the 18th century wanted «to live by the works of hands». This labour, eschatologist, universalist, mostly Russophile Hebraism solidarized with the National Bolshevik Russian current of «Left-Imperialists», seeing in the October Revolution not the end of the national dream, but its beginning, a new red dawn, the second coming of the Soviet Rus, of the secret Kitezh of the Old Believers, lost in the dark bicentenary of St Petersburg's Synodal unsacred parody. Bolshevism had gradually absorbed in itself not only the orthodox Marxists, but a large number of SRs, specially left-wing SRs, which could be defined as the Russian analogues of the National Revolutionaries. In a word, the Jewish organizing into the Bolshevik ranks represents the logical and triumphal conclusion of the historical path for the enormous organic Jewish sector, the roots of which lay in the distant religious disputes of a grey Middle Ages. As the enemies of this eschatological community of «Jewish Orientalists» stood all the capitalists of the world, and specially the Jewish bourgeois, secular, empirical (on Marx's expression) incarnation of the the ancient Rabbinites. From here also the paradoxical Bolshevik «anti-Semitism», not alien also to many Jewish Communists. Agursky refers in his work a most interesting case, when the Jew Vladimir Tan-Bogoraz intercedes for a Russian Bolshevik who has afforded a rough anti-Semitic tirade, not only intercedes, but fully justifies him. How this resembles the quoted story of Zoharites!

By the way, we find something similar also in other spheres. So, for example, the famous founder of the Bavarian lodge «Thule», preparing the birth of the National Socialist Workers Party of Germany, Baron von Sebottendorff, in his time was initiated to the «Egyptian Masonry» in Turkey by a married couple of Jews-Sabbatists and from them received the bases of esoteric science. But thus he himself differed from manifest anti-Semitism (not to mention the about ordinary nazis). A Jewish (specially Sabbatist) trace can be found and in a number of other strongly nationalist, sometimes openly racist or anti-Semitic organizations — both European (masonic), and Eastern (Young Turks). On the other hand, anti-Semitism could be directed also to the opposite side, and and in this case its bearers could quite be either Jews or politicians controlled by them. So, for example, are widely known the anti-Semitic expressions of Churchill, who, referring to the Jewish origin of the majority of the Bolshevik leaders, spoke about «the Jewish menace threatening civilization from the East». Thus, Churchill in his political career leaned on the right-wing Zionist circles of Great Britain and the US, as Douglas Reed convincingly shows. Hence, just as there exists «Right» and «Left» Hebraism, so there is a «Right» and «Left» anti-Semitism. Thus also in this question we come to a more complex pattern. From February to October, there passes the watershed between the two halves of the Jewish world, and since a definite moment this opposition acquires its most severe forms. In extreme cases the representatives of both camps resort in their polemic to argumentations almost not dissimilar from the rough vulgar speech of the anti-Semites. But this is not all. At the climax of confrontation, the collision acquires the nature of war of physical destruction, as we see in the history of Stalin purges among the ranks of the Soviet government.

6. To live by the work of hands

There is no doubt that the Jews differ by their unique ability in some social, economic and cultural areas. Centuries of diaspora have taught a lot to a small but resistant, persistent people wishing not to miss their ancient dream, their millennial religion, their remote promise. Looking at everything around as something temporary, distant, transitory, the Jews have worked out a number of striking dynamical features allowing them to be instantly guided into social dynamics, in the rapidly ongoing processes of a state and national scale, flowing into the environment of the «big peoples», which, «being always at home», understood everything with a definite lag, with slow, a-posteriori reflection. But these skills could be differently used in the different situations. So, the Jewish Bolsheviks have gathered all efforts, all national talents, all spiritual powers to the creation of the most powerful Soviet state, the empire of social justice, the Eurasist bastion of overland geopolitics. And the manifold elements of the Jewish diaspora in Europe, America, Asia, coming from the same religious-spiritual, mystical, spiritually «Orientalist», «Eurasist» environments, were for long decades a structural support for the Soviets, the geopolitical agents of the Great Eurasia, the guides of Bolshevik Messianism. It was just them who basically formed the Third International, later Comintern, the powerful Eurasian network, the subtle agency of Moscow in every corner of the planet. But again, we shall stress that we are not simply talking about the Jews, but about a special category of Jews, about a special Jewish camp, about the «Jewish Eurasists». By the way, at a definite stage they, these «red-brown» Jewish Eurasists also have prepared the creation of the state of Israel, having started under the direction (and the approval) of Moscow a hard fight with the English Atlantists, with the forces of capital and liberal democracy. They formed the axis of the Israeli left-wing forces, a fruit of whose efforts were the famous kibbutz. Again, the same Zoharite «to live by works of hands».

The apologists of Hebraism as such, exhibiting all Jews as extremely innocent victims, can find no way to explain why, in times of severe repression as the Leninist and Stalinist purges, Jews were not only the victims, but also the jailers; and not only individually, as single persons, but just as a group, a party, a faction. This circumstance – never explained either in the anti-Semite, or in the Judeophile framework – can be actually explained, since under the Soviet power the internal fight within Hebraism did not cease. Bolshevik, «Hassidic», «Zoharite» elements well knowing the skills and the snake-like moods of their own co-nationals, their taste for intrigues, chameleonism, conspiracies, mercilessly fought the bourgeois elements of Hebraism, together with the residuals of «Jewish Occidentalists», the heirs of the «Rabbinite» spirit, the ideological descendants of the «Mitnagedim». From here also stems the paradox: why, at the centre of purges of clear anti-Semitic accent, there stood always and everywhere also Jews? A classic example of such position can be found in Lazar Kaganovich, most loyal follower of Stalin, convinced and staunch National Bolshevik, whom the Russian nationalists, completely misunderstanding, have unfairly turned into an emblematic figure of «Jewish conspirator». It would be difficult to invent a greater «anti-Semite» (in its anti-Talmudic sense). How the internal drama of Soviet Hebraism evolved in the times of Lenin and Stalin – this was a passionate, heroic epoch, full of ups and downs, which (we have no doubt) one day will be conveniently and detailedly described.

7. From crisis to collapse

The critical point in the history of Jewish Eurasism is 1948. In this moment Stalin and his entourage come to the conclusion that with a creation of the State of Israel, which right at the beginning had been enthusiastically supported by the Soviet government as a Hassidic-Socialist construction, proved an instrument of the bourgeois West, as the line of the capitalist «Mitnagedim» gained supremacy in it. Zionist tendencies began to be awoken also in Soviet Hebraism, and it meant that the initiative was passing to the residuals of the «Occidentalists» sector, whose total eradication was only apparent and whose damage aroused even the vigilant suspicions of the Jewish Eurasists. This moment was fatal for the whole Soviet state, for socialism all over the world, as shown by the last events of the end of our century. When the anti-Semitic tendency within the Soviet government grew beyond definite limits — especially scandalous was the destruction of the Jewish anti-fascist committee, entirely made of convinced Eurasists and direct agents of Lavrenti Beria (which speaks only to their benefit) — only the most resistant Jewish National Bolsheviks (the same Kaganovich) could remain unshakable on Russophile, Soviet-Imperial positions. As a whole, in the eyes of the Jewish masses, the influence of the Eurasists was sufficiently weakened, and their basic geopolitical and ideological line essentially discredited. On the other hand, from the party and military environment the highest power positions began to be restricted to the Great-Russian and Small-Russian (Ukrainian) elements, who were far from being able to clearly understand the Messianic path of left-wing nationalism, Messianic National Bolshevism, founding the spiritual union of Jewish and Russian Eurasists since the beginning of the century. This new generation felt itself more as étatistes than apostles of a New Truth, inheriting either the military «Romanov» spirit of the Czarist caste of war-specialists, not fully eradicated by the Bolsheviks, or as simple populists, manifesting worker-peasant chauvinism with a definite component of unreflective, instinctive anti-Semitism. These army cadres, not knowing the Revolution and the supreme spiritual, historical effort that accompanied it, did not penetrate into the subtleties of national politics. A singular deafness to this issue was a typical mark of those from Ukraine, who since a definite time — together with Khrushchev — began to occupy more and more tightly the supreme powers in the USSR. And, though immediately after the death of Stalin, Beria completely stopped the anti-Semitic «affair of the doctors», the irreparable had occurred.

Further there happened the fatal crisis. The Russian-Jewish, Eurasian-continental, international-Imperial, Messianic, revolutionary current being the vertebral column of the Soviet Power, was weakened, cracked, deformed at its base. State, authority, economic organisms began to operate inertially. The purges, at whose roots always invariably the fundamental ideological, metapolitical reasons laid hidden, were over, and in their place came the fuzz of clans, the gradual «embourgeoisement» of socialism, its sliding into philistinism, into meanness. Revolutionary eschatological pathos vanished. The Soviet state was left to keep on only inertially. The world base of the eschatological Eurasist Revolution had essentially turned into a normal state. Powerful, great, original, but deprived of the heat of its original ecumenical mission. At the level of Hebraism this meant the full defeat of the «Hassidic-Sabbatist» camp and the gradual coming to primary roles of the Jewish rationalists, Kantians, humanists, Mitnagedim, Occidentalists. The secret alliance to National Bolshevism was terminated, Jewish Orientalism was

quickly marginalized. Its influence, its positions catastrophically fell. Gradually the type of the Jewish Bolshevik was pushed to the edge, and within the leadership of the Jewish community in the USSR the representatives of the Maimonidean, Talmudic brand were put forward. More often in a secular humanist liberal version. This bourgeois, right-wing Zionist flank henceforth worked only to the collapse of the Soviet formation, prepared the great collapse of socialism, undermined this giant geopolitical construction from the inside. By the way, in unison with this destructive anti-Eurasian tendency worked also definite anti-Semitic circles within the KGB. This only aggravated the dissolving of that spiritual, cultural and ideological synthesis, which was the mysterious propellant of the original Bolshevism, of National Bolshevism. Anyway, the collapse of the Soviet State was the direct result of the withdrawal of the Jewish lobby from the creative statist Bolshevik position and its direct or indirect complicity with the hostile anti-Soviet Atlantist capitalist West.

8. Towards the Eurasian future

The model we described in its general contours, allows us to look with new eyes at many problems linked to the obscure levers of Soviet history. Let us remark that this approach can also be applied to different geopolitical systems, since something similar can also be met in other countries and other political contexts. By the way, the great writer Arthur Koestler pointed to the theme of the fundamental duality of Hebraism, offering a thesis which was questionable from the ethnological point of view, but rather expressive from the typological point of view, about the «Turkic» racial origin of the East European Jews, «Ashkenazi» as a whole, being the heirs of religious Judaized Zoharites – whence also the known dualism between Ashkenazim and Sephardim (pure Semites). In the case of the Karaites, i.e. another anti-Talmudic direction in Hebraism, the fact of a derivation from the Khazars is considered as unequivocally proved (see L. Gumilev). It is curious that Douglas Reed agreed with the theories of a Turkic derivation of the «Ashkenazim», considering this kind of Jews as a ramification of the «Turkic-Mongolian race»!

It is important to stress a different aspect. Jewish Orientalism is not an especially modern, exclusively Soviet phenomenon. It is rooted in the depths of national history. Probably behind it there is some terrible religious or racial secret. Anyway, there is no doubt that the victory of the «Mitnaged» lobby, of the Jewish Occidentalism, is not and cannot be an irreversible and accomplished event. It is impossible to deny that the positions of Jewish Orientalism are weak and marginal now as never before. But it might well be just a temporary phenomenon. The national identification of a definite part of Hebraism is inconceivable without the spirit of sacrifice, great compassion, agonizing and idealistic search for truth, without deep mystical contemplation, without disgusted scorn for the dark slavish laws «of this world», for the laws of the market and of egoistic interest. Jewish Orientalism, the deeds of humbleness and sublime insensateness of the first legendary Tzaddiks, the sincere compassion toward our fellow creatures, irrespective of their racial and religious origins, the fanatical belief in equity and the honest building of society, and at last, that vaguely-guessed solidarity with another tragic and beautiful people

of history, too elected, chosen by God, the Russian people – all this cannot be uprooted from a definite part of Hebraism, it is inseparable from its unique destiny. Pressed between the (partly justified) anti-Semitism of the Russian patriots and the westernist, rationalist, market-oriented, destructive and anti-statist material matrix of the present Russian Jewish liberals, Jewish Orientalism experiences hard times. But we must not despair. In the life of this people there have been worse trials. It is important only to realize its choice, to interpret its place in history, to consistently find out its geopolitical and spiritual orientation. And from their side, obliged by their responsibility, and in the light of all this tragic historical experience, all consequent eurasists proclaim: there will always be a place for «Jewish Orientalism» in the ranks of the builders of the Great Eurasian Empire, the Last Empire. But the betrayal of the Great Idea we shall not forgive and we shall not forget, never and nobody. Neither ours, nor the others.

THE SITUATION ABOUT THE ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

Alexander Dugin, Polyarniy Izrail (Polar Israel), Nov 2000 (7)

This text from an interview to part.org.ua (Ukraine), translated from Russian by M Conserva

The situation holds an enormous historical meaning. We are at a fatal turn: the US surrender Israel, which served them as a strategic bastion in the Near East during the “cold war” period. The Jewish diaspora – the part which identified itself with the destiny of globalism and Atlantism – appears in the rôle of betrayer of the Messianic impulse laying at the basis of Israel. When the Russian-Jewish messianic, eschatological alliance laying at the roots of the USSR was broken, the first to suffer was the Union, the active, passionate and united Jewish minority joined in undermining the bases of Sovietism. As a result – perestroika and the ruin of a superpower. Israel and the Jewish “software” in the US, in Europe and the insider layer in the USSR, unitedly have brought down a great Eurasian empire. But the great collapse of the Union revealed the substance of the US, now calculating the Atlantist surrender of Israel – since in the absence of the USSR, the Arabian world, whose petroleum allows to hold side by side Europe and the US, is more relevant than “a handful of zealots”. And the Jewish lobby, AIPAC etc. show themselves as the spokesmen not of the Jewish National Religious interests, but as simple globalists and fawners at the service of Washington. The situation in Israel once again proves of the absolute correctness of geopolitical analysis. I foretold all this. Now it is clearly visible. Contrary to the almost anti-Semites, evil is not the Jews, evil is Atlantism. And within it, those Jews who work for Atlantism, but not only them. Today the Jews are brought as a victim by Atlantism. The fact itself of such a possibility is the proof of the correctness of the Eurasist analysis. The US are not governed by the Jews, they are governed by Leviathan*, “Great Confusion” and “sacred demon”, this rogue outside of nation and religion. While the US exist, evil exists. I am convinced that the situation in Israel will change the balance of power in the Eurasist camp, reorienting many Jews to Russia and depriving many Russians of

their anti-Semitic prejudices. The situation with the Serbs and with the Israelis is analogous. The US play the Islamic card to their own benefit.

The pro-American attitude of many Jews as a matter of fact stems from widespread anti-Semitism, than from the modest uproar of Russian nationalists, confused with the historical moment. Who outraged Joseph's tomb? Pamyat? The Russian National Unity Party? No, it was outraged by Gusinsky and Yossi Beilin, Albright and Eagleberger, the sponsors of the "peace process". Everything fits in its place. I think this terrible situation will make a lot of people recover their wits. As always and ever, the blame goes only to the Atlantists, who want to impose to the world their order – without religions, races, hierarchies, cults, cultures, languages, rites. Probably, the Israelis believed that they could deceive the devil, and the cosmopolitan world without religions and castes would make an exception for the small Middle East state. It did not. It is time to go back to the origins – to Eurasia, to where we belong, to where we draw force. And at last, the situation in Israel got fire too early, before a serious force could rise from the side of Russia and the anti-American sector of the Islamic world to the rigorous and proper Eurasist solution of the situation. Events do anticipate geopolitical reflection. Considering how slowly and with what internal buzz the truths exposed in my works on geopolitics reach the necessary people, I begin to understand what Cassandra must have felt.

* "Leviathan" in the terminology of geopolitical science symbolizes a maritime, "mobile", commercial civilization (examples – Athens, Carthage, England, the US) in contraposition to "Behemoth" – symbol of a continental, "static", non-commercial civilization (examples – Sparta, Rome, the Golden Horde, Russia) – note by V Bukarski.

Communiqué from the web-site of Arktogaia

ArchivEurasia (Wayback Machine), Apr 2001 (8)

On Apr 21 2001 in Moscow the constituent congress of the All-Russian Political Social Movement "EURASIA" was held. It was attended by delegates from 51 regions of the Russian Federation. The following members were elected to leading positions

Chairman of the Political Council: Alexander Gelevich Dugin.

Vice-president of the Political Council: Petr Evgenevich Suslov.

Have entered the direction of the Movement:

Supreme Mufti of Russia, Sheikh-ul-Islam Talgat Tadz'ud-Din.

Rector of the Russian Orthodox University, Ioann Bogoslov

Prior of the Aginsky Datsan, Andrey Lupsandashievich Dondukbayev;

Hassidic rabbi, founder of “Be’ad Artzeinu” Party, Avram Shmulevich.

The movement is created on the basis of the Eurasist ideology and inter-confessional harmony in support of the reforms of the President of Russia Vladimir Vladimirevich Putin, and is built on democratic foundations. Anyone can be member of the Movement who wishes to share the principles of Eurasism, patriotism, social justice, and to support the purposes and the tasks of the Movement.

The website of “Be’ad Artzeinu” (For our Homeland) is here (9), almost entirely in Russian. Now let us examine the ideas of the aforesaid Avram Shmulevich:

AVRAM SHMULEVICH: THE MAN OF THE COUNTER-ÉLITE

Vasily Zharkov, Jewish.ru, Jun 2001 (10)

The dissident from Hebron – They say that he never parts from his automatic gun. And this is not surprising, since he lives in Hebron. It is not necessary to explain that such is life in Hebron, where Arab bullets and rocks are as normal as crowd in the Moscow underground. I shall say honestly, in his place I would rather live in any green suburb of Tel Aviv. But he considers that the land on which he lives belongs to the Jews, and leaving his own land leads nowhere. The mysterious Avram Shmulevich was known to the Russian public after his article on Nezavisimaya Gazeta, in which he told about war events in Hebron. Then came the sensational interview on the newspaper Zavtra. The movement he is leading, Be’ad Artzeinu, picketed the Latvian embassy in Israel. Finally, Alexander Gordon himself invited him to his broadcast “Gloomy morning”. Hastily uttered in the receiver a friend, journalist of one of the main newspapers: «Couldn’t you find us, Shmulevich?» But he was already back in Hebron. And still our conversation took place, at midday on a hot Jun 4. From the windows, the noise of Moscow in a working day. Into the editorial office enters a tall, sturdy man. One might think he had come out of an old photograph taken at the beginning of the century: kipa, beard, black suit. To say the truth, in his arm he held a suitcase, no automatic gun. Avram Shmulevich calls himself a Traditionalist and says he fights against globalisation. He supports his arguments by quoting the Torah and Lenin. But, one way or another, they make sense and, by common judgement, he has his own supporters. Having read our interview, everyone can come to his own conclusion. At the centre of our talk was contemporary Israel.

Q: Every day we receive alarming reports about the events in Israel. How do you personally evaluate the present situation? How much acceptable is, from your point of view, what the Sharon government is doing?

A: Unfortunately, the Sharon government, and all the so-called right-wing camp, already formed at the times of Netanyahu, once again has fully shown its weakness. As a matter of fact Sharon differs in nothing from the Labour government. He even seems to be much worse. I would rather Barak were still at the power. With him, at least, the terror did not reach the present level.

Q: And what happens in the Jewish settlements?

A: The day before yesterday at night, a good friend of mine was killed. He was 51 years old, he was shepherd in the Jewish settlement of Susa. He leaves nine children. He lived in faraway farm and led the lifestyle of the traditional Jew. They attacked him in a field, hit him with knives and then shot him. And so it is practically each day, but the Sharon government does not react in any way. In the country the national spirit is broken, and the present government has no reasonable exit plan from the ongoing crisis.

Q: Which political forces inside Israel do you consider most negatively?

A: We stand against those forces which have open anti-Israeli positions. There are now three such parties: the ultra-leftist Meretz, Shinui and Democratic Choice. The Shinui party, like it is called, is strongly anti-clerical. It is not simply anti-religious, it is anti-Semitic and, as a matter of fact, makes use of images and rhetoric from nazi Germany. Let's recall that the known journalist and party leader Tommy Lapid recently stated that Haredim are as much enemies as Hamas. At the latest elections many Russian Israelis voted for Shinui. Against the Jewish tradition is also Democratic Choice, headed by Roman Bronfman. This movement appeared in more times, having broken away from the "Russian" party of Sharansky, Israel ba-Aliya. They have not passed the election test yet, but the European Council has already given some \$400k to their support. This money will be spent on leading seminars among the Russian public. As to the Meretz party, it is made of homosexuals, Arabs, supporters of legalisation of soft drugs, etc.

Q: How much popular are they among the immigrants from Russia and the CIS?

A: It is necessary to say that the Russian public is rather sensible to such rhetoric. All the more so, since right-wing parties and traditionalists practically carry no activities in the "Russian streets". In one of such organisations, for example, the office charged with connections with the Russian press was recently shut. No wonder, then, why they look through left-wing glasses.

Q: And what do you think about those politicians oriented to the "Russian street", like Natan Sharansky and Avigdor Liberman?

A: You know, it is first necessary to ask what I think in general about politicians. Churchill in his time said that the politician differs from the statesman in that the former thinks of the next elections while the latter thinks of the next generations. Unfortunately, in Israel not only there are no statesmen, but the

majority of the players on the present political scene do not even correspond to the definition of politician.

Q: Does really everything “stink”, in today’s youth slang?

A: The Israeli political élite experiences now a deep crisis. Such a situation was created, as was labelled by Lenin (following Italian sociologists) with the formula: “Those at the bottom do not want; those on top cannot.” Mass media, special services, analytical structures are completely slaves of the left-wing philosophy. Those who do not share left-wing, anti-religious and anti-national views, cannot reach beyond some definite level in their career. Let’s say, in the army one is stopped somewhere at the level of major. In journalism it is simply impossible to find a job. In the Israeli media, there is the unwritten rule according to which a man sharing national views can appear on the TV screen or the radio broadcasts only in the event that he is either a full moron, or an extremist, whose ideas are certainly unacceptable to the majority of the people. The same is true of the universities’ humanistic branches. For example, when an acquaintance of mine, senior lecturer in Jewish literature, got a teaching post at the Tel Aviv university, the managing teacher said to him:

For us the only question is between those who like Jerusalem and those who hate it. So, here we all hate it.

The Tel Aviv university is some kind of a citadel of anti-national forces. There is even no synagogue. And when the students tried to open one, the management of the university refused, considering such step as “favouring religious intolerance.” Thus they put Christmas trees. There is no need to explain that in West this is an integrating part of the main Christian festivity.

Q: Of whom is then formed the contemporary Israeli élite?

A: From laical, anti-religious, mostly Ashkenazi forces. Among the whole population of Israel they amount to no more than 10%. But they really hold in their hands the control levers of the country, be it in business, in the government posts, in the management of the army and the special services, in the media, and, accordingly, among the politicians. This closed élite also leads the Israeli society. It does not receive the information from the outside and is cooked in its own juice. Worthy people, enterprising and independent in their views, have no chance to make their way through this sieve and to reach the top level of power. This is one of the causes of that crisis experienced by Israel.

Q: What does this crisis consist of?

A: The country does not practically have any development strategy. Neither in the field of security, nor in the economy, nor in the social sphere. The gap between the poor and the rich widens. During the years of the Labour government this division grew even stronger. Earlier Israel was a really socialist country, which had taken all the best from the socialist model: help for the needy, state care for the

interests of the entire population, etc. Since the end of the 1970s, on the one hand, in many respects due to Likud's fault, the erosion of the socialist frame began, but, on the other hand, a true capitalism was not built either.

Q: Are you not afraid that some your expressions might drive back the majority of the Russian Jews, who hear in your words the rhetoric of the leaders of irreconcilable opposition here, in Russia?

A: Firstly, what I say is not my own fiction, but objective facts. Secondly, the present situation begins to be perceived by broader and broader layers of the population, and by the people who stand at the top. That for the first time Israel has no strategy, I heard say a few years ago from one of the high-ranking servicemen of the Israeli special services. Within a definite circle, among the technocrats responsible for concrete solutions, this issue is known and debated already for a long time. But very seldom there is someone who calls things by their names, talking about the whole picture. The man I mentioned, for example, had in mind the conditions in the field of national security, defence and foreign policy. However in the economic and social sphere the situation is exactly the same. So, unfortunately, it is an objective process.

Q: Does this mean that Israel and Russia have now common problems?

A: As a matter of fact, many processes now taking place in contemporary Israel are similar to what may be observed in Russia. However, on the whole it is necessary to realise that we are talking about different countries. Israel, in spite of everything, is a prospering country with a GNP amounting to \$100b and one of best armies in the world in terms of strength and readiness to combat. According to the leading British magazine on military issues, Jane's, the fighting power of the Israeli army exceeds that of all the European member countries of NATO taken together. Therefore the scale of Israeli crisis, certainly, is much lower than that of Russia. Nevertheless, the difficult conditions of both countries have common roots. First of all, the process of globalisation. I am not against new information technologies, but they enable to quickly and totally export any ideology and to impose it to all the rest of the world. Properly speaking, it already happens: through soft methods the American philosophy, the American lifestyle and the American political pattern are imposed, and, most important, US economic influence is spread. Any country, any company wants to increase its own profits and aims at holding a leading role. This can be achieved by exporting ideology and social model. So America imposes its will to the majority of the countries of the world. The world conforms itself to a common standard: the people, the ideas, even nutrition become standardised. To this are also interested the transnational corporations oriented to world-wide mass consumption.

Q: But what if the Americans provide economic and military aid, including to the Israeli state?

A: Everyone knows that Israel receives aid from the US in the range of \$3b/yr. It means only 3% of our GNP. \$2b go on military requirements, \$1b on civil requirements. And the defence orders can be placed only to US factories. As a result, the Israeli army has an expensive dollar and an expensive shekel, and our own war industry suffers a loss. It happened that the Israeli company "Rafael" elaborated a new kind of "air-ground" missiles, yet buys them in the US. The matter is that the Americans, participating to

the financing and joint elaboration of new technologies, have the right to veto the sale of such technologies to other countries and demand that they should be made only in the US.

Q: You will agree, however, that it is possible to provide a mass of critical examples, yet it is much more relevant to work out an adequately positive program. Can you propose something in exchange?

A: A structural reshaping of the Israeli society is indispensable. Besides, it is necessary to change the political system, making it more open and dynamic. The ageing ruling élite, established in Israel since the 1930s, should be set aside, and in its place new forces should come. But to this purpose it is first of all important to understand what kind of situation has developed. Israel tried to use an alien development model, which, certainly, is completely unacceptable. We have our own civilisation and culture. Properly speaking, every people is unique, and the political system of each country should be built according to a pattern which is adequate to its own national traditions. This also concerns the Jewish people.

Q: What should be the “national pattern” in Israel?

A: We have the Torah. Without entering the debate about its Divine origin, we see a simple fact: the Jews exist for 4,000 years, they are the most ancient people in the world, having passed many times through repression and persecution on every continent. The Talmud compares the Jews to a lamb living among 70 wolves. But thus there is a regularity: there, where the Jewish communities based their life on the Torah and the Halacha, they proved capable to resist external oppression. There, where the Jews deviated from tradition, either destruction or assimilation was waiting for them. That is, we have patterns developed through the millennia, which respond to our national character and our national features. The state needs to be built not according to the prescriptions of Hollywood or the Chicago school, not according to Turkish, English or American patterns, as it is being done now in Israel, as on the basis of our inheritance, Jewish law. In this consists also the philosophy of traditionalism, which we profess.

Q: And what about such concepts as “democracy” and “human rights”? Are they stipulated by the Halacha?

A: Democracy is a very broad concept. It is not simply that parliamentary kind of state structure which prevailed in the West after WW2. By the way, Judaism does not contradict at all the principles of democracy in its wider meaning. You know that in the ancient Middle East there were despotic regimes: Egypt, Babylon, Persia, etc. As to ancient Israel, there was, one might say, a constitutional monarchy. In the Tanach it is told how Queen Jezebel, one of most evil governors of Israel, wanted to get a vineyard, laying near her palace, from a simple Jew. When the master refused to sell the lot of land, Jezebel commanded to kill him. This roused terrible indignation in the country, and, eventually, as the prophet Isaiah writes, the queen was sentenced to death. Dogs tore her into pieces. In any Eastern despotism the land would have simply been confiscated, while here we are talking about the need to buy it. That is, already 3,000 years ago in Israel there existed the laws which could not be broken by the rulers. And when King David bought a place for the Temple from non-Jewish people living there, he too did not start by simply seizing it, he paid money. Therefore in Israel, as we see, there always existed an order,

influencing the way the people took their decisions. Democracy is not an alien concept for us. But democracy should be Jewish.

Q: Say, how many belong today to your movement?

A: For a rather long time we simply existed as a circle of intellectuals, sharing the same ideas and elaborating all these problems. In the near future we do not plan yet to get out into the political arena and to become a party with all its indispensable attributes. There is no use in entering now the Knesset. The people have not yet fully realised the situation. But we are ready to co-operate with all political forces, as in all camps there are forces interested in the conservation of the Israeli state. If today's negative tendencies will develop further, the country could have to face problems which it would not be able to solve. Even within the so-called left wing, there appeared people who start to realise it. I think that if we can show ourselves as a mighty force and draw to our side the proper political circles, there is a chance for the alternative we propose to be realised.

Q: Now in Russia such concepts as PR and political technology have become very fashionable. Without them no political movement can count on real success. And how do you feel about political technology?

A: A strange question. It is like asking how do I feel about atmospheric pressure, whether it influences a man's health. There is a mass consciousness, a psychology of the masses, and there are the ways to influence this psychology, the methods for manipulating mass consciousness. This is, by the way, one of the weak points of the present model of democracy. It would seem that everyone comes to his own decisions. But the development of technologies and the mass media, such a powerful information flow began to fall on the people, that if you are the most ordinary man, as not a specialist in the field of politics, you are no more in the condition to understand how the real political process is going, to see those complex mechanisms which govern the modern world. Into mass consciousness only shreds of information are thrown, as a matter of fact, clips. Look at today's television – we are back to the times of pictography! By creating this or that image, the media manipulate the philistines' consciousness.

Q: Does political technology exist among the participants in your circle?

A: Certainly. Political technology is for a party what the studio is for the internet web designer. Any political man, declaring anything about himself, must do this in a form which can be understood by the masses. Now, unfortunately, gone are the days when Marx issued his many volumes of Das Kapital.

Q: Which Russian political technologist deserves your respect?

A: I would prefer not to answer to this question...

RUSSIANS AND JEWS AGAINST THE OLIGARCHS

Polyarniy Israil (Polar Israel), Jul 2000 (11)

Avrom SHMULEVIC's interview to Aleksandr PROKHANOV, editor of the newspaper Zavtra

Q: Not often rabbis go to the newspaper "Zavtra". What is the purpose of your arrival in Russia?

A: I was invited by the government of Tatarstan in Kazan to participate in an international conference on Eurasism at the threshold of the 21st century. The invitation was originated by the distinguished Russian philosopher Alexander Dugin, advisor of the chairman of State Duma Seleznev. I presented there a report on the theme "Israel, Jews and Eurasia in a geopolitical outlook". Now I am going back home in Israel.

Q: And, probably, you have noticed, how in the context of political events of these last days in Russia again there was a Jewish theme. Completely unexpectedly. There is a growing feeling, that both Russian and world Hebraism will be torn by some new conflict. The illusion about the consolidation of Hebraism is vanishing. We see that Hebraism is shocked by crises — both in Israel, and in America, and in Europe. And it is especially sharp here, in Russia, when two factions of Hebraism act in sharp conflict. What are the bases for this drama?

A: I think that at first is necessary to explain on a broader scale what is Hebraism in Russia. Many simply do not understand it. As a result of which some myths dominate, which have no relation at all to reality. In my opinion, these two factions, as you said, of Russian Hebraism do not show at all the true interests of Hebraism. What is Hebraism as such? The Jewish civilization is one of the most ancient civilizations in the world. It is possible to say that we exist as long as the world exists. The Most High God talked to Adam, obviously, in Hebrew. And everyone, I think, realizes the contribution which the Jewish people has made to the development of the world civilization. The Jews have religion, specificity, traditional values, and during centuries, through all persecutions, through two terrible catastrophes, the expulsion and destroying of the First, and then also the Second Temple, the Jews always saved their national identity, sentiments of unitary purpose and unitary values. The Jews always resisted to cosmopolitan tendencies, which were directed to the dilution of the Jews among other peoples.

But during the last 200 years the Jews were touched by the problems of all world. In the last 200 years on the world scene, at first in Europe and then also everywhere, there arose new ideologies. They are often called cosmopolitan. In Russia the term "globalist" will be ever more used. Within the framework of these currents there is a mixture of cultures and traditions, nations reincarnating. The concepts of national honour, denomination become confused. And religious values become but a toy. All this touched also the Jewish side. More than a few Jews have been departing from national traditions and attempting to merge with other peoples. Thus they first of all acted against the people, against the tradition. In these 200 years began the mass withdrawal of the Jews from Judaism, as of Russian from Orthodoxy. That ended with a complete atheization. In Europe the same happened, only to a lesser degree. As opposed to anti-national, cosmopolitan forces, inside Hebraism has arisen Zionism. Its basic idea is to gather the Jews on their historical native land. And their life under the law of religion. Not in America, not in Russia, but in Jerusalem, Hebron, Shechem and so on. This tendency met a strong reaction among the cosmopolitan part of Hebraism and among other peoples. There is such term:

“nomad-people”. Now in connection with the propagation of the international capital all borders between nations, religions, cultures appeared completely superfluous. They are confounded by transnational corporations which have no face. Never mind, who stands at the head of such corporations — Chechen, Jew, Russian or Chinese. On their “premeditation”, it is possible to convert all the world in “nomad-people”. Today you dwell here, tomorrow — absolutely another place. In the West it was possible to build life just that way.

The same forces which stand behind the idea of the “new world order” want to impose such style of life also to Hebraism. From the psychological point of view, maybe, with the Jews it can even be made more easily. When a man finds himself among another people, even if he tries to merge with this people, more often such merger fails in the end. And then a feeling of national discord is being shaped. And such peoples are always a fertile ground for cosmopolitanism. If you look at many leading figures of international transnational corporations, at the ideologists of globalism, frequently you will meet there people belonging to national minorities, grown in another environment. Certainly, it is not their fault, it is a simple result of a psychological factor operating. Zionist religious ideology, once again I want to stress, is not a cosmopolitan ideology, which is often assigned the purposes of capturing the whole world. On the contrary, Zionists consider that all Jews should live in Israel and be occupied first of all with Jewish problems, not interfering in the businesses of the surrounding peoples, adjusting with them a mutually advantageous, if possible, relation. As it was defined by Vladimir Jabotinsky, perfect Russian writer, by the way, celebrated stylist, one of the chiefs of Zionism in the first half of the century, the relation of the Jews to other peoples should be expressed by the formula: “polite indifference.” That is, first of all, we should solve our problems, and then only think of the solution of other peoples’ problems. If they will ask us about it.

The cosmopolitan fraction in world politics sticks to a different approach. It interferes with businesses of all peoples, destroying all traditions to make something like a melting pot. It can result in a second world deluge. What is such world deluge? It is when the waters have rushed on earth, because that partition which separated sky and earth was breached, wherefore there was a universal mixture of all with all. The modern world in the epoch of globalization stands before such a danger. That is, all national cultures are threatened with an inundation of globalist “waters”. Not without reason the centre of the globalist world are the US, a country without nationality, without a definite religion, which became the embodying of the globalist dream. This process is favourable to America. The patriotic forces in Israel consider the situation so grave, that they tender to unite with patriotic forces of all peoples, forgetting our differences. Though on principle we have nothing to share. God has given a definite place to each people. Nothing happens in the world accidentally. The most important thing is to understand what your people wants. And to not attempt to hold another’s place. If each people will sit under a fig-tree, as the Bible says, then true peace is possible. Only on this ground cooperation is possible. Differently, if everyone will interfere with another’s businesses, it will result, I repeat, the second deluge.

Q: You wanted to explain why inside Israel, Jews kill Jews. Why the Israeli society is not monolithic. Why it is divided not on parties, but at a fundamental level. It seems like in Russia the conflict between the oligarch Gusinsky and President Putin is somehow linked to the Israeli conflict.

A: Really, everywhere the fight is reaching its climax between two tendencies: National-Zionist and cosmopolitan, whose representatives find themselves in the US government. The Jews to some extent are a “soft power” safeguard of peace. And to capture this “soft power” is then to seize power over the whole world. As a result the Jews too will appear dispossessed of national roots. You see in what consists the so-called “peace process in the Near East”, when lands are returned in exchange for peace. The first colonists in Israel died for these lands. They came on a land which was not developed at all, which was occupied by hostile peoples. They have won, have mastered it. And now it is returned simply for a piece of paper. Why? Because such words, as a native Land, honour, religion, have ever less meaning in our world. One of the leading forces in this process is the extreme left-wing party Meretz. Globalist and pro-American. It is necessary to mark that in Israel the concepts of “left” and “right” designate political forces rather different than in Russia and in the remaining world. Our left-wing forces are anti-national, cosmopolitan. A similar ambiguity of concepts between the Jews and all the remaining world is rather often met. Israel is always very severe referring to the army, to the people who died defending state interests. We always tried not only to redeem the prisoners of war, but also to find the dead. In 1968 there was such a case, when a submarine built in England was lost in the first immersion on the way to Israel. During 45 years the search did not cease. And last year it was found in the Mediterranean sea at the depth of 2000m. It was lifted. It was a festival for the whole country. There was also a television broadcast, with many politicians participating, and one of the leaders of this party Meretz, Shulamit Aloni, said literally the following:

It is perfectly useless to have lifted this boat. It was not necessary. Because it results in a display of militarist moods. And we now are in the era of peace. The army is absolutely not necessary to us.

Our anti-national tendency reaches such a point. As to Gusinsky, it is necessary to understand that he does not represent the interests of Israel and the Jews. On the contrary. All mass media belonging to Gusinsky in Israel, also there are leading the same anti-state processes, as in Russia. They act also at us as the instrument of denationalization. If in Russia they act against war in Chechnya, in Israel they act against war with the Arabs. If you change the word Russia to the word Israel, and translate the texts from Russian to Jewish, you will see the same: Gusinsky — a representative of the new Atlantist, globalist movement.

Q: Is it not a contradiction that the globalist pro-American élite created the Zionist Israel, and, constantly warranting the existence of Zionist, National Hebraism in Israel, will use it at the same time as an instrument of globalism?

A: America did not create the state of Israel. It was created by the forces of wide Jewish mass. America began to support the state of Israel already in the last stages of its building. If we remember historical facts, this is how it went. In 1954, in Egypt with the support of CIA there came to power the so-called young officers led by Nasser. Then there was a struggle between England and America. The American neo-colonialism made all efforts to shatter the English colonial system and to rise on its place. And the

basis of the English colonial system was the Suez Canal. The CIA had prepared this revolt against King Farouk. And Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, and hammered the last tack into the remains of the English colonial system. Then Khrushchev, having bought Nasser's anti-Imperialist slogans, began to send him massive deliveries of weapons. And though Nasser had been an officer of the Wehrmacht, fighting on Hitler's side, all the same he was given the rank of Hero of the Soviet Union. As a result, Israel found itself in a very difficult situation. Only eight years had passed since its birth. There was no war industry. The Israelis were compelled to search for allies. The strategic union was concluded with France. It was the basic weapon supplier to Israel before the war of 1968. Enormous efforts were made to observe a neutrality policy.

Israel, despite the pressures of the Americans, has not entered in NATO. We never had permanent US bases. Though the Americans offered enormous money, and the economy of Israel was in state of building. The US Sixth Fleet really went and goes on repair in Haifa, but has no permanent base. That is Israel tried to manoeuvre. And the USSR with all its policies kicked it towards America and staked on the Arabs. But remember, in 1972 they rather perfidiously expelled the Soviet military advisors from Egypt. The break took place after all Arabian officers had been instructed for tens years in USSR military institutions. That is, they knew all secrets of the Soviet Armed forces. After the break of the relations with USSR all this knowledge in an eye-blink was transmitted to the US. But even after that, the leaders of the Soviet Union, following, on my sight, suicidal policies, did not enter in any contact with Israel. That was completely inexplicable from the point of view of elementary political logic, and maybe became one of the reasons of the crash of the Soviet Union. As against the Soviet Union in relation to Israel, in Israel anti-Soviet, anti-Russian propaganda was never conducted. Prime Minister Ben Gurion even at the end of his life, and he died at 70, talked with delight about Lenin. In Israel, they always talked with respect of Russian culture. And that Israel was compelled to become a strategic ally of the US was attributable not to internal political processes in our country, but to Soviet Union policies. Take the same question with Jewish emigration. You know that the Jewish religion and culture was completely suppressed in the Soviet Union. Practically at the beginning of the 1970s in the USSR there were no rabbis left with a proper education. People either were deported, or had left, or were at the time of repressions. That is, the national life was in every possible way stifled. As a result the "persons of Jewish nationality" felt like in another's country. And became the guides of the globalist ideology.

Q: It seems to me that, apart from the political situation, Russian Hebraism (I realize, not unanimously, but I leave this term for convenience) always considered America as a baseline country for itself, a country where there are many Jews, where they hold strong financial and political positions, where, as a matter of fact, the Jewish community is dominant. And at the same time it is known that this community feels the strategic instability of its stay in America, above which hang serious threats. It feels that the Black, Muslim majority, anti-Jewish in spirit, is growing. Israel finds itself in an Arab encirclement. Various forms of pressure by the state are being increased. There too is getting uncomfortable. Probably the hour is coming when will arise the problem of moving the centre from the US to here, to Eurasia. Some Jewish figures already openly talk about it. France was offered as a baseline country, but France is too close to Germany. And there there is the threat of national revanchism, which, if it materializes, cannot be but anti-Semitic. Also there is the idea of moving such centre to Russia, a country with huge

space and enormous resources. With the Russian people, which once mobilized can perform prodigies, defeat Hitler and construct the tower of Babel. According to this idea, moving the centre to Russia, the creation of the so-called “new Khazaria”, would provide the Jews with safety, and the sum of efforts would convert the country into a superpower of the 21st century. This conspirological conception cannot but alarm Russian patriots, which see in it straight expansionsim. Though eschatologically the community of Jews and Russians was felt by many philosophers and intellectuals in Russia. For example, patriarch Nikon. Russia he treated not only as the Third Rome, but also as the second Jerusalem. He believed that the second coming would take place in Russia. He created the New Jerusalem under Moscow and has transferred there not only geographical coordinates, but also great symbols: Tabor, Golgotha, road to Calvary. Maybe it was the first attempt of moving the Jewish tablets to Russia. What can you say about it?

A: A most original concept. Sounds very beautiful. But it leaves out at least two fundamental things. First, the Jewish tablets can only lie in Jerusalem. The same as Moscow for Russians. Zionism, on the contrary, in every possible way contributes in the Jewish emigration not only from Russia for creation of the Jewish state from the Nile to the Euphrates, according to the Lord’s testament. Second, I do not think that America in the near future is threatened with great danger. America is an extremely stable country. Everyone who governs America, well knows the business. Geopolitics is studied there by all power structures of the country. Read the books of Brzezinski or Clinton — precise strategy everywhere is devised, in which there is a place for Negroes as manpower, there is a place both for globalist Jews, and Anglo-Saxons, and Russians. America definitively linked its destiny to the realization of the globalist project. It is and will be the centre of transnational capital. All the best in the world should flow to this country. And it happens. Capital and the best intellectual forces are attracted there. And as to the Jews, once again I shall repeat that for them departing from tradition, religion, native land is a national death. If a Jew changed to another belief, all the family should refer to him as he had died. It is the religious law. As to Berezovsky, I remember what about him was told in Tatarstan, where he recently paid a visit. When they invited him to visit a synagogue, a mosque and a church, he said that his first wife was Jew, the second Russian, and the third Tatar. Therefore, they say, he feels connected to all religions. Such a frivolous type has no interest for me. He is simply a player, and plays any game he knows. And Gusinsky, undoubtedly, is a personification of transnational groupings. Therefore the conflict between these two people cannot be considered as inter-Jewish.

Q: In Russia in the last 7 or 8 years anti-Jewish moods were boosted. The reason is that the majority of the population has found itself in poverty, has lost the forms of self-display, and among the oligarchs the overwhelming majority are Jews. The social disaster has appeared coloured in a national tone. Oligarchs, which apparently have nothing in common with National Hebraism, have devised the scarecrow of “Russian fascism” as a means of neutralizing the social protest.

A: All this plays in the hands of globalism, and is the means with the help of which globalism is spreading. Really, all these new-Russian “persons of Jewish nationality” have only a genetic relation to Jewish culture and traditions. Nobody among them knows hebrew or respects Jewish rites. The same Berezovsky — he is simply a convert. For you Berezovsky may be also a Jew, but for me he has no relation to Hebraism. The same is true of all these “new Russians” of Jewish nationality. Certainly, they

can return to the roots, become rigorous Jews, but now they are representatives of the “nomad-people”. Dispossessed of national roots. While those Jews who have these roots should leave for Israel and live there. On the other hand, they feel their vulnerability, and naturally, though not being at all conscious agents of globalism, they become guides of its ideology. That in turn, naturally, calls for the reaction of nationally-oriented Russians, who, lacking knowledge, understanding of the situation, direct their negative attitude on all the Jewish people, in particular on the representatives of the Zionist movement, who are actually allies of the Russian patriots. It alienates the patriots of Israel from the patriots of Russia, and boosts the globalist tendency. In Israel the epithet “fascist” is recently being used as well for the Jewish patriots. And those Russian patriots, who fix their attention not on our common enemy, globalism, but on the Jewish patriotic Zionist movement, they too play in the hands of the founders of the “new world order”. In this sense they are even worse enemies of Russia than the globalists. Because they as it were kill Russia from inside. They fight against windmills. And the actual enemy remains behind brackets. And keeps on doing what he wants.

AP: The Soviet Union was traditionally pro-Arab. Since there were so many Turks, Orthodoxy and Islam in the Soviet epoch had as though a common enemy — Hebraism. Now there is a striking transformation. I do not know where it will lead us. Somehow, incidentally or according to the logics of national development, or with the help of the system of strategic provocations, it was almost possible to sow discord between Orthodoxy and Islam. Maybe this began even in Afghanistan. With the Chechen war all this aggravated. The basic relations between Orthodoxy and Islam began to crumble. But the Orthodox did not become allies of Judaism. They remain as though alone in the face of these two metaphysical opponents.

A: Why do you consider that Orthodoxy and Judaism are metaphysical opponents? And why do you consider that Judaism and Islam are such opponents?

Q: Because all practice of deliveries of weapon, practice of conducting battle operations, expansion, intelligence services, historical practice tells me that exactly in these areas there are collisions. Because each Orthodox person feels hidden anti-Biblical moods. Also hopes for the New Testament as his true Book.

ASh: That the Russians feel detached from the Old Testament, it is very symptomatic and nice. From my point of view, the Old Testament belongs only to the Jews. That is, like each people should mind its own business. You have your tradition, we have ours. Naturally, these traditions can be incompatible. If we make them compatible, we shall get the American variant of religiosity, when there is no discrepancies between Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Jew. The union of tenets and religious concepts is impossible. Clearly, from the point of view of the search for truth these religions are incompatible. But it does not mean that if these religions are incompatible from the point of view of metaphysics, they should be incompatible from the point of view of earthly practice. From this point of view, the end of your last question seems to me very wise. Either we should put to ourselves the purpose to destroy each other, so that the Orthodox should eradicate the whole world, except for Orthodox, or we should understand that we should coexist. A man has a family. A man is one thing with his parents and children. But he feels a definite distance in relation to other families. It does not mean that he is in conflict with them.

Together with you the neighbours do live. You do not let them into your deals, into your house. But you can perfectly coexist with them. All of us are neighbours. It is not necessary to blend with each other. It is not necessary to mix into each other's business. Everyone should live under a fig-tree. Therefore that tendency, about which you spoke in your question, does not worry me at all.

Judaism has no unremovable metaphysical contradictions with Islam too. We have a conflict around a definite lot of land, which we lawfully, on the basis of the Bible, consider as ours. And the Muslims simply have been living there a long time and they would not like to leave. Such conflicts can be decided both through peaceful and military ways. In history they always are combined. But these conflicts do not concern fundamental things. And the unions are concluded not with Islam or with Judaism, but with definite regimes. The Islamic world is absolutely not uniform. And look – in Chechnya you are not at war against Islam. The relations with Turks and Arabs are very miscellaneous. And there is still India, Pakistan, Indonesia. Wahhabis act in Chechnya, Uzbekistan. But they act also in Israel. America's globalists use the religious tendencies for their purposes. A bright example — Kosovo. This hotbed is necessary to America to press on Europe, as on a competitor. Kosovo, crowded with narcotics, as a small growling hound, which the globalists can release at any moment, if Europe "behaves herself badly". Palestinian autonomy plays the same role for us. America presses Israel to leave the conquered lands, and now from the hills of Judea it will be possible to fire from guns at Tel Aviv. Encircling Israel, the Arab world finds itself completely under control of America. And in case Israel would show obstinacy, buses in the streets of our cities will be blasted. But a big mistake would be to attribute these blasts to the results of a metaphysical conflict between Judaism and Islam.

Q: You have formulated an enemy image. Conditionally speaking, it is globalism. Transnational capital. That is a threat both for the Russian and for the Jewish patriot. How the patriotic forces of Israel and patriotic forces of Russia could interact?

A: They can interact very well. Russia and Israel have a lot in common. In the sphere of foreign policy there are no points where interest would be opposite. Israel and Russia are interested in each other economically. The basic money is now nested in precision technology. In rifles, which one stand \$7k. Helmets provided with night vision devices. Light bullet-proof vests. Laser guidance systems for firing automatic weapons. Revolutionary technological changes are required. In the Soviet Union even in the last years of its existence there appeared a technological lag vis-à-vis western countries. Now war industry is completely disorganized. There are no cadres. No schools. I do not think that Russia by its own forces could liquidate this breakthrough. And Israel now in military know-how holds a leading place in the world. For example, I repeatedly spoke with our tankists, and they affirm that from the point of view of mechanics and armour Russian tanks are better. What a field for cooperation! Uniting the military potentials of the two countries, it is possible to create a magnificent 21st century weapon. And more – if America offers military help to Israel, this is not absolutely what could be from Russia. 6%, no more, from the national budget, and at such condition that most of the commissions is allocated to US enterprises. As a result Israeli industry is wrecked. By uniting our efforts, we can achieve independence from America.

Q: What are you doing at home? What is your occupation?

A: I am a man of religion and historian. I teach. I study the history of the Jewish-Russian interaction. History of the Russians, who accepted Judaism and now live in Israel. The history of Russian sectarianism is a high, original, beautiful spiritual search.

«HERE EVERYTHING AS USUAL: THEY SHOOT»

Alexander Sherman, Nezavisimaya Gazeta, May 4 2001 (12)

Avram Shmulevich considers that Russia and Israel have interests in common, both strategically and as civilisations. Avram Shmulevich is a Chassidic rabbi, historian, known publicist and public figure. He lives in the ancient city of Hebron, where the Tombs of the Ancestors lie. There were buried Abraham, Sarah, Isaac and Jacob. The word “Hebron” is related to the hebrew word hubur – “union”. According to the legend, through Hebron runs the axis connecting the world of the mountains with the world of the valleys. Today the front line between Jews and Arabs also runs through Hebron. This interview with Avram Shmulevich was given one month before the recent Hebron tragedy, when a Palestinian sniper shot a 10-month-old girl and wounded her father. The victims were neighbours of Avram Shmulevich.

Q: Avram, what is there now in Hebron, what is the situation?

A: Here everything as usual: they shoot. We are constantly under fire from Arab snipers. And besides, if in the beginning of the present outbreak the media informed about it, now 90% of cases on the whole do not reach the media. We represent a convenient target. The city of Hebron lies in a valley. All the hilltops around are Arab. Thus they constantly fire against us from dominant heights, the approaches to the Jewish quarter are exposed to snipers’ fire. Some days ago my wife got under fire, the bullet of the sniper came half a meter from her. They shot against my children too.

Q: They purposely shoot on civilians?

A: In the evening we pull the shutters down, so that what happens in a flat cannot be seen from the outside. The external walls around of my windows are covered with tracks of bullets. Under the Oslo Agreement the Israeli army has the right to pursue terrorists in the territory monitored by the Palestinian Authority. But practically it never happens. And in the first days of war (and even the Israeli authorities recognised that this is war) the shots were rather casual, then they have learned, they made experience, and the fire became aimed. A couple of months ago the Arabs changed their tactics – they have begun each day to mine and to fire at roads.

Q: Who exactly fires? Which among Palestinian organisations takes responsibility for conducting battle operations?

A: They do not take responsibility, they simply shoot. Actually this organisation is called "Government of Palestinian Authority". The Palestinian Authority represents a semi-state. There are various forces in it. First, the so-called "Palestine Liberation Army", which Israeli mass-media bashfully continue to call as "Palestinian police". Actually they are professional troops. At the moment of the creation of the PA, already there were armed formations deployed in the neighbouring Arab countries. The citizens of these countries, calling themselves "Palestinians", enlisted in them. For example, that crew which entered in Hebron after the signing of the agreement about the surrender of Hebron, was earlier deployed in Iraq. It was a subdivision of the Iraqi army. They took part in warfare in Kurdistan (where they killed Kurds), participated in the Iran-Iraq war on the side of Iraq. They are Iraqi Arabs, who called themselves "Palestinians". Besides there are forces made up with local residents. They are called "Tanzim". There are also terrorist organisations, such as Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Palestine Liberation Front. Hebron is a traditional stronghold of the Islamic organisation Hamas. They have no regular armed formations, as the PA governments does not suffer competition. There are subversive groups. The shooting from mortars and automatic weapons is made, as a rule, by regular PA forces.

Q: Now 56 Jewish families live in the centre of Hebron, as a matter of fact in conditions of blockade, in the middle of battle operations. Why do you live there, why don't you leave?

A: We live here for the same reason for which people live in Moscow or Paris. They live in their cities. And Hebron is our city, a Jewish city. Why should we leave it to go anywhere? If misfortune has come to your native city, yet it does not mean that is necessary to run from it. Hebron is a city in which the Jews lived during 4,000 years. From it began Jewish history.

Q: You are known as a public figure taking unconventional positions for modern Israel. You act against union with the US and for union with Russia. How is such position motivated?

A: As to my relation to Russia, it just the traditional relation for Israel. Here you see two global civilisational tendencies in action: the first one is called globalism, or the New World Order. It is the tendency described, in particular, in the works of Jacques Attali and Brzezinski, translated into Russian. They affirm that we now enter an epoch of globalism: a world without borders and nations, but under centralised control of the US. The second tendency is "Eurasism", that is preserving the originality of the peoples and nations dwelling in the Eurasian continent. In particular the Jewish people. As a Jewish traditionalist, I am a supporter of the Eurasist line.

Q: As an historian, could you outline for our readers the historical roots of today's situation in the region?

A: Israel always tried to follow autonomous policies and not to be oriented towards any single force. It is impossible to forget about the role of the USSR and Stalin in the creation of the State of Israel. Only thanks to the support of the Soviet Union the United Nations adopted a resolution about the creation of the state. America backed it and recognised Israel first, but some time later withdrew its consent to the creation of this state, and besides Western countries (the US, France, England) imposed an arms embargo against the country. As a result, immediately after the declaration on the creation of the State of Israel, the regular armies of five neighbouring states – Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq – invaded its

territory. The Trans-Jordanian army was exhibited as the “Arab legion”, while it was simply part of the armed forces of Great Britain. Israel could resist only because Czechoslovakia, following the USSR decision, gave weapons to Israel. Stalin could be possibly accused of everything, but not of mistakes in foreign policy.

This was accomplished in full correspondence with the laws of geopolitics. Stalin rightly considered that Israel would follow independent policies and become a backweight to then existing English influence in the Near East. Despite of his anti-Jewish initiatives (the “doctors’ affair”, the “anti-fascist committee”), relations with Israel were saved. A short time before Stalin’s death they were interrupted, then again repaired by Beria, and maintained until the end of 1956, that is before the coming of Khrushchev. Khrushchev undertook a revision also of foreign policy. Never before him did either Russia or the USSR count on Islamic states. The Soviet leaders clearly understood the problem of Islamic extremism, in consideration of the large Islamic presence within the same Soviet Union. Also Arab regimes were never considered by Russia as allies, as they were strongly linked to England, France and – subsequently – to the US. The Arab élites not only kept their money in the West, but also sent their children there to study. The financial system of the Arab world was, and remains to the present day, part of the Western financial system. This situation did not arise yesterday, nor accidentally. The English long worked upon it. According to their tactics, the élites of the colonial peoples were included in the ruling élite of the Empire. They granted them complete freedom to deal with their peoples the way they considered necessary.

Democracy has nothing to do with it. The English were interested to preserving to the highest possible degree the social and political formation usual for these countries (contrary to the legend about “the White Man’s burden”). Till 1952 in Egypt there was a monarchic regime. De jure Egypt was independent, but actually everything there was administered by the English. The country had an enormous relevance for the whole West because of the Suez Canal. In 1952 there came to power a group of young officers led by then-Colonel Gamal Abd’el-Nasser. Nasser, it is necessary to say, was pro-Hitlerite, co-operated with the Abwehr, and in the cabinet of his closest associate and heir Sadat, Hitler’s portrait was hung until his last days. The coming to power of the “young officers” was helped by the CIA. Then the representative of CIA in Egypt was the grandson of Roosevelt: this gave him wide possibilities in the sense of access to the political summit. In that time the English empire already was at its last gasp, and the US struggled with England for domination. Probably, there was also a more far-sighted policy, as we may judge from further events, because when Nasser came to power under the slogans of social justice, he established contacts with the USSR. Khrushchev decided to change its strategic line and made a bet on the ruling regime in Egypt, the “Arab socialists”. But you know how socialist they were.

This bore consequences for Israeli-Russian relations. So, at the beginning of 1956 an agreement about deliveries of Soviet oil to Israel was concluded. All oil stocks then were under control either of the West, or of the Soviet Union. In Israel, as everyone knows, there are no fields. This agreement meant the full exit of Israel from the sphere of geopolitical influence of the West and, hence, the possibility to lead independent policies. It is necessary to remark that, in spite of the fact that the then recently formed NATO block was extremely interested in having military bases on Israeli territory, the Jewish state rejected the invitation of the western alliance to conclude an agreement directed towards co-operation

against Russia. And then the array of forces was such, that practically all countries in the region – Turkey, Iran, Iraq – entered the anti-Soviet coalition. Israel refused to grant the bases for deploying NATO troops. All Israeli governments stuck to this rule. In territory of Israel there have never been any foreign military bases, including Americans.

Q: But nevertheless, in 1956 Israel allowed England and France to use itself as a picklock for Suez, nationalised by Nasser, and moreover Ben Gurion wanted this war and this alliance.

A: I would say that it is just Israel who used them. After the Arabs' defeat in 1948 war actions went on. In the border regions – in Sinai and in Gaza training centres of fedayyin-saboteurs were created. And these fedayyin penetrated in the territory of Israel practically each day, they reached the suburbs of Tel Aviv, committed assassinations, assaults on the civilian population. In the year 1956 alone 256 civilians died by their hands. It was impossible to accept such a situation, and Israel started war operations, having obtained co-operation from England and France. Nasser then nationalised Suez, straightforwardly encouraged by the Americans. The Americans thus drove in the last nail in the coffin of the British colonial empire. As a result of joint war action by England, France and Israel, the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza sector were completely cleared of Egyptian troops and fedayyin bases. The US and the USSR have then exerted an enormous joint pressure on Israel. US warships were moored along its shores. It was an open threat of embargo on part of the Americans – the blockade of the country. And Khrushchev stated that he would send troops to help Egypt. Eisenhower let Israel know that the US would not oppose this. Therefore Israel sent its troops to Sinai after half-year of occupation, but the military operation achieved its purpose: Israel was free from subversive bases on its borders. At the end of 1956, Khrushchev broke the agreement on oil deliveries, without a warning, unilaterally, setting Israel in a completely desperate condition. The country was compelled to conclude a viable agreement with the Americans. The economic and strategic co-operation between Israel and the US started from this moment. Israel entered its sphere of geopolitical influence.

Q: But you see, Ben Gurion aimed at this union, didn't he?

A: Ben Gurion did not aim at strategic union. On the contrary, he tried in every possible way to avoid it. Before the Six Days War in 1967 the basic weapon supplier to Israel was not America, but France. There's more. The Six Days War began with the sinking the US ship Liberty in the Red Sea (no, in the Med – RB). Then, it's true, Israel apologized for it, they said it was a mistake. But today historians consider that it was not a mistake, but a purposed action. America has always been the basic partner of the Arab countries. The Arab élites oriented themselves towards the Americans after the dissolving of the British empire. But after the Six Days War, France broke its agreement on military cooperation with Israel. At that time it had already lost in Algeria, and from there came the flow of Arab emigration. They were compelled to come to terms with the Arab countries. By the way, well-known is the case of the torpedo-boats which Israel should have received from France under agreement. France decided not to give these boats, after money for them had been already paid. The ships, held back by the French, were stolen from Marseilles by Mossad agents. The Americans started massive weapons deliveries to Israel after the end of the Six Days War, when the country once again proved to be the strongest in the region. And after the Six Days War the USSR was practically in a state of war with Israel. The Arab armies were

trained by Soviet advisers. Israel had no choice. After the coming of the Americans, certainly, the expansion began not only in the military sphere, but also in the spheres of ideology and culture. The Americans tried to educate the population in their spirit, to buy the ruling élite. This is especially evident of the judicial system, the mass media.

Q: Similarly, nowadays the whole of the political and the financial system of Israel is americanised and incorporated in the globalist system.

A: No, not the whole. A portion of the spectrum is. First of all, the Labour and the Meretz parties. The latter is an extremely globalist party, they are more globalist than the Americans themselves. But it is impossible to say that the national and especially the religious camp are incorporated in the system. A significant part of the Israeli people belong to religious traditionalism, to which the US system is alien. Besides, a significant part of the Israeli political and military establishment refers rather critically to the US influence. An often debated issue is US military help to Israel. This help stands at about \$3b.

Q: Yes, it is a lot for a country of five million citizens.

A: For a country whose GNP is \$100b, it is little, 3% of GNP. Israel GNP is comparable with the GNP of Russia. From the economic point of view, Israel is one of leading countries of the world. Militarily, according to a recently published estimate of a leading world source of expertise in the military field, Jane's Review, Israel's military power exceeds the battle power of all NATO countries taken together. According to foreign estimates, Israel has about 300 nuclear warheads. The readiness of its pilots is the best in the world. Israel is a developed country, and those \$3b granted by the US have no particularly great significance for it.

Q: Then it's not clear, taking them, what for?

A: The question here is: America gives them, what for? It gives nothing for free. On contract clauses most defence jobs from this money must go to US enterprises. The US helps itself, thus creating jobs, and Israel's own industry is wrecked to its roots. Thus, one "cheap dollar" which lays idle buys an "expensive shekel" which can be deducted from taxes. Therefore, many weapon systems that could be produced by Israeli enterprises become simply unprofitable if produced in Israel. Besides, thanks to its involvement in military projects, the US has the right to impose its veto on weapon deliveries to countries which they are not interested to sell weapons to. Thus, they get a chance to control not only the domestic, but also the foreign policies of Israel. One of the points of Netanyahu's program was to gradually get rid of US help. But Israel cannot refuse, just because most of its ruling élite, as you correctly said, is incorporated into the US system. They live, to put it mildly, under a strong influence from America. For example, some time ago suspicions flashed about the destination of the funds released to the PA for some social works (it seemed, for the repair of water drains). It was discovered that this money had been transferred to the accounts of some Knesset deputies. As the Americans began to check into this, Arafat said: «Excuse us, it was a mistake, we will make amends», and the deal was hindered. In a normal country such an event would call for investigation. According to the report of the state inspector, before the last elections Labour received grants from the Jimmy Carter Fund, a significant quota of whose capital, by the way, comes from an Anglo-Pakistani bank. Left-wing parties

have spent for election campaigns much more than those of the right-wing. In particular, there appeared to be grants being transferred from America. All of us remember the pressure which Clinton exerted on Israeli electors, pronouncing himself for Barak. The Americans have played a significant role in Labour's victory in 1993 elections, exploiting the issue of the so-called "warranties", that is money which should be granted to Israel for receiving the flow of immigrants from former USSR countries. The Americans directly stated that they would not give the money to the right. A whole brainwashing campaign was put up by the press. They told things as if Israel could not survive without this money. Then, true, they found out that this money for receiving the olim (immigrants) was absolutely not needed, and it was spent on completely different purposes. Yes, in Israel there is a number of "élites" (politicians, academic establishment, mass media, the judicial system) with which the Americans actively work. At the same time, giving a serious basis to strengthening US positions demands also that they support Israel during United Nations votes. If not for the US veto, the Arabs, owning more than 20 votes, would be able to pass practically any anti-Israeli resolution. Russia till now votes with the Arabs. Of course, the US administration profusely makes use of this arm.

Q: How do you evaluate today's socio-political situation in Israel? Are there forces able to overcome this situation become pathological?

A: Israeli society is in a state of crisis. The élite does not express the interest of the people, it is alien to them. A significant case occurred some years ago, when a couple of hundred activists of the Hamas organization were deported from Israel to Lebanon. When they had already been set on buses, Israeli attorneys produced to the High Court of Justice a request to revoke the decision on deportation. While the claim was considered, they stood some days at the border, then they were sent all the same. It is interesting that at that moment a poll was conducted among the people. From all those asked, 93% supported the decision on deportation. The poll among journalists gave similar result, but with the opposite sign. That is, 93% of the representatives of the mass media were against deportation! Spectacular opposition. The ruling élite fully solidarises with US policies. This concerns also a significant part of US Jewry, which represent the vanguard of globalism. According to the tendency of the NWO, national traditions must vanish, a "new man" ("nomad-man", according to Jacques Attali's expression) will be educated, not being linked in any way to the land, to tradition or to religion. This tendency meets a strong resistance in Israel, but nevertheless is successfully put into practice. The NWO is interested in forces of the Jewish people. If the Jews after Rabin, Peres and ultra-globalists like Meretz will abdicate to their tradition, Judaea, Samaria and Jerusalem will count only as military and strategic values, which we give or not depending on the political situation, but the history and tradition of the people will not mean anything for them, which of course will very much help strengthening the NWO. For this reason the Americans spend large efforts directed on the subordination of Israel to their ideology. But, I repeat, a significant part of the people do not support these attempts.

Q: We are in a situation where the ruling élite of Israel is oriented to America, and on the other hand the Russian political élite educated in Soviet times refers to Israel practically with hostile moods. What will be the outcome, and what are the chances of "reorienting" Israel in these conditions?

A: The problem of Russia is that until now it does not have a strict national foreign policy line reflecting national interests. There is no understanding of the geopolitical role of the state. In the best case the foreign policies of Russia in the last years were guided by momentary reflexes, in the worst case they directly contradicted national interests. In that New World Order about which we spoke, there cannot be a place for Russia as a great power. In the world there cannot be two superpowers. But Russia is too large and original a country to suppose that it might be satisfied with the role of England, which completely forgot about its former imperial majesty and now is the compliant executive of the Americans' will. Somewhat it is possible to say that the Russians and the Jews swapped their places. During WW2, Hitler swore the Jews total physical destruction. As to the Russians, their destruction was not supposed, but they would be lowered to the role of slaves, servants of the Third Reich, servants of the dominant nation. Just about the same happens also now concerning Russians and Jews. In the plans of the NWO, Israel and the Jews can exist, but only as a serving force, having lost their independence. They can be allowed no further than the anteroom of the NWO. As to Russia, according to this plan it should be erased, at least as an independent imperial force. We all know the extent of depopulation occurring now in Russia. We see how its economy collapses. In these conditions it would be reasonable to expect from the Russian government, from the Russian establishment, to really realize the threat hanging above the country and try to prevent this threat. But unfortunately this does not always happen. If we look at the Arab world, we see the Arab countries now simply practically waging war against Russia. Arab mercenaries form the main part of the forces now fighting in Chechnya. The Arab countries are the basic force supporting Islamic fundamentalism in the territories of the Central Asian republics.

In these conditions a community of interests of Russia and Israel is created, both strategically and as civilisations. It is also necessary not to forget about those old connections existing between the Russian and Jewish civilizations. The Jews from ancient times live in territories afterwards included in the composition of Russia. Strictly speaking, the same Kiev was built as a Kazakh fortress on the Kahanat border. The Russian state was originally called as Russian Khanate. Russian culture had an enormous influence on the formation of the Israeli culture. On the other hand, very few know, for instance, that "Katyusha" is a Jewish national melody. The prospects for developing relations do exist. As both the Russian and the Jewish peoples value their authenticity, it would be natural to expect that we become allies in the fight against Atlantism. This does not mean that we together should declare war on someone, but it would be very logical to join intellectual and political efforts in the issue of protecting our interests. The question is whether there will be forces inside Russia which can go in this direction. The second question is whether there will be forces capable of countering to pressure of the Atlantists inside Israel.

Q: What can we expect from the Sharon government? How personally close is he to these ideas?

A: Sharon himself substantially understands the essence of ongoing geopolitical processes. The conclusion of a strategic union with Russia stands among his tasks. Whether he can make it, it is difficult to say. The Sharon government has a big problem, as does in general the whole right-wing camp. This problem is the absence of a precise ideology, which would dot one's i's. I am talking about a new civilisational impulse. The Israeli Right should precisely state that the ideology of globalism and

cosmopolitanism threatens the existence of the Jewish state, that the Jews want to build their state on the basis of the Jewish national tradition and values. But the Sharon government has not made this declaration, it is not in the condition to do it. Nor has his government univocally stated that the "peace process" is finally stopped.

Q: «Is there anything are more important than peace»? Why do you consider that the peace process should be terminated?

A: The so-called "peace process", as a matter of fact, is but one of the instruments of strengthening US influence in the region. It is necessary to understand that the PLO already for a long time belongs to the sphere of influence of US interests. Tight contacts between the PLO and the CIA began in 1982. In the present moment the situation is that the PLO is to a significant degree armed with NATO weapons. PA special forces and security services are trained and armed by the CIA. The CIA is one of the participants of this "peace process". CIA officers act as intermediaries between the Arab and Israeli sides. The same concerns also Egypt. Syria too substantially stands in the US orbit. America applies the known principle "divide and rule", controlling both conflicting sides. Therefore the "peace process" exclusively benefits the Americans, serves to strengthen their strategic position. Of course, at the cost of weakening Israel.

Q: And how do you evaluate the chances of Russia as "co-sponsor of the peace process"?

A: I cannot say that I see a significant understanding of the situation from the Russian side. Russia did not act against the plan of introducing United Nations forces on Israeli territory. Israel itself did not accept this plan, but the precedent of posing the question took place. The dynamics of development of events in the last years shows that after Yugoslavia the next object of application of "international force" can become the territory of the Russian state (Chechnya, other regions). I talked with some Russian politicians. They think that this situation is not similar to the Israeli-Palestinian problem. They speak approximately so:

Well, Chechnya is all the same Russian territory, it does not have a status fixed by international law.

These references to "international law" surprise me, since "international law" today is the right of the strongest. In this case, what America will say, that is "international law". Who could suspect some years ago that against the UN Charter, NATO forces would start acts of war in Yugoslavia? It would be possible to bring the leaders of NATO countries to an international tribunal for starting war operations contrary to the decision of the United Nations. There was no mandate of the United Nations for this NATO operation. However the "international community" has swallowed these things. The partition of sovereign Yugoslavia is actually complete. Kosovo has separated from it. Now, being under protection by NATO forces, Albanian guerrillas invade Serbia's own territory, and in the last days war began also in Macedonia. Therefore references to the fact that Chechnya is territory of sovereign Russia are inconsistent. When the possibility will appear, they will not stop anybody. Nevertheless Russia did not

act against sending troops in the region of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Let's remind that Israel is the only country whose parliament adopted a resolution supporting the position of Russia concerning the Chechen conflict (in spite of the opposition of "left-wing" forces). Israel also backed Yugoslavia. The Israeli volunteers fought on the side of the Serbs. Israel refused to grant troops and bases for NATO operations in the Balkans. But, for instance, it granted the Serbian government the communication satellite AMOS (domestic production), after the international embargo was imposed on Serbia. The Americans sometimes referred to this issue with protests. Israel answered them, "yes, we did not notice," and kept maintaining the Serbian connection. Russia continues to support (anyway, verbally) the "peace process," which, I repeat, is extremely unprofitable for itself. I was especially depressed and surprised by the reaction of the so-called "National Patriotic Camp", which fully backed the PLO in the arisen conflict.

Q: And why were you surprised? It looks objective. Some Russian "National Patriots" probably look for financial support there.

A: They cannot ignore that the sponsor of the "al-Aqsa Intifada" is Saudi Arabia. The same country that also supports Chechen guerrillas. It seemed that from the "National Patriots" it would be possible to expect a greater understanding of the national interest. It has not occurred. Let's hope that the Russian politicians will have enough courage to understand that now the moment of truth has come. In the near future the problem of the political future of Russia will be decided: whether it will be united and independent, or will completely fall under the influence of the West, and the process of its fragmentation begun ten years ago will irreversibly proceed. In these conditions Russia, even more than Israel, should be interested in any allies which could help it counter this process. The same process of subordination to western influence of the political élite and mass-media which happened in Israel now happens also in Russia. It also handicaps mutual rapprochement. The future will show whether the Russian government will be wise enough to take the initiative in its hands.

Q: Now you and your supporters in Israel look as original "Eurasist partisans". Do you plan to pass to open political activity in the near future?

A: Yes, we do. The country is in a severe political crisis. Now in the Israeli political arena there must be a movement directly affirming that Israel should change its foreign policy priorities and system of values. In Israel there are real forces interested in quitting the orientation to the unipolar world, the one-sided orientation to America. But in today's conditions a significant part of Israeli society (its overwhelming majority) does not have a political force expressing its interests. There is no force possessing a precise, motivated ideological line of opposition against the NWO, against that one-sided geopolitical orientation by which the Israel establishment is guided now. Our movement, that for a long time existed as a non-political, cultural-civilisational social force, enters at present also the political arena. This movement will voice new principles of Israeli politics, escaping from the above-said, and will achieve their realisation.

Finally, as if the above were not bad enough, we find an even more obnoxious ultra-Zionist involved, if this anonymous and undated (2004?) communication (13) to the admittedly erratic Barry Chamish is to be believed:

Hello Barry, There has been a recent important development in this. Avigdor Eskin has been elected (in absentia) as a member of Political Council (leadership) of "Eurasia" Movement based in Moscow, Russia. The Eurasia socio-political movement is financed and structurally supported by Russian Federal Security Service (FSB) and Russian Presidential Administration. Although it is officially a "patriotic", "neo-Eurasian", "anti-American" organization, it serves the purpose of NWO and is paid by its emissaries in Russia. Basically, it is a pro-NWO party which hides behind a pseudo-patriotic facade. The official organizer is talented Russian geopolitician and political philosopher Alexander Dugin. It seems they are trying to use Avigdor Eskin and his cohorts to smooth the relations between pro-Western Russian elite (Putin, etc.), criminal oligarchs (Deripaska, Abramovich, Chubais, etc.) with Israeli business elite and political circles. It is known that Avigdor Eskin has connections with Israeli lobby in Washington, with the late Republican Senator Jesse Helms, and with head of Committee on International Relations of Russian State Duma Dmitri Rogozin, and has been used to make contact between Russian and US administrations.

This admiring feature in VDare (14) confirms Eskin was involved with Jesse Helms. It is also quite recent, Jun 2011. Here are the more pertinent sections (minus quite a lot about his white power activities in south Africa, which he holds to be a natural ally of Israel):

Avigdor Eskin (15), the hard right Israeli activist, is a fascinating figure. Eskin, who makes his living consulting for Israeli companies that do business with Russia, has been an ally of 1980s US conservatives, Russian nationalists, and Afrikaner rights activists. He has been attacked and harassed by both the Soviet KGB and the Israeli Shin Bet for his activities. He is probably the only Zionist activist who has been declared persona non grata and deported from the USA. He's a case study of the National Question: whether a nation, an ethno-cultural entity, can find political expression in a state, in a particularly intense context. Eskin was born in 1960 at the height of Soviet power and raised in a secular Moscow Jewish family. But at the age of eleven, Eskin began covertly to listen to the "Voices": Western radio stations like Voice of America, Voice of Israel, and the BBC Russian service. Eskin began attending synagogue soon afterwards, becoming interested in religion under the influence of a Ukrainian Catholic friend. The young Avigdor became an Orthodox Jew and a dedicated Zionist activist determined to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. Despite harassment from the KGB, Eskin persisted in his activism, becoming the youngest underground Hebrew teacher in Moscow and translating Rabbi Meir Kahane's hard-line Zionist manifesto *Never Again* into Russian via samizdat.

After years of trying, he was allowed to leave for Israel in 1978. Right after arriving to Israel, Eskin became active in the late Rabbi Meir Kahane's Kach Party, which called for the annexation of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, Israel's permanent refusal of US and any other foreign aid, and the removal or "Transfer" of the Palestinian Arabs from Israel. Eskin makes Avigdor Liberman look like a milquetoast peacenik. He has even accused Liberman of selling out, by coming up with a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict that involves Israel giving up land for peace, Arab-majority towns inside pre-1967 Israel for large settlement blocks, as well as handing over parts of Jerusalem. Eskin also accuses Lieberman of being more concerned about the standard of living in Israel than maintaining it as a Jewish state. Eskin says he does not see anything "racist" or "inhumane" about the Transfer. Unlike so many US Zionists, who fight Israel's wars from the comfort of an Upper New York East Side penthouse, Eskin volunteered for combat duty when he came to Israel. As a member of an artillery support unit for a paratrooper detachment, he participated in the 1982 invasion of Lebanon and was wounded in battle against the PLO and the Syrians on the shores of Lake Qaraoun in the Bekaa Valley. In the 1980s, Eskin visited the US and met the late Jesse Helms, one of the most conservative members of the Senate. Originally, Helms was an acerbic critic of Israel. He demanded that Israel return the West Bank to Jordan and wanted the US to break off diplomatic relations with Israel after its invasion of Lebanon. But after befriending Eskin, Helms became a supporter of Israel, seeing in the Jewish State, an ally against communism and the anti-Western Arab regimes. He visited Israeli settlements in 1985 and became a dedicated supporter of Israeli control over the West Bank and Gaza. It must be emphasized that Eskin, like his mentor Rabbi Kahane, has always opposed foreign aid for Israel from any country, and is forthrightly critical of the current US role in the world. Eskin admires true USAian conservatives like Jesse Helms, but criticizes the US for its globalist, interventionist, Wilsonian foreign policy, as manifested in the bombings of Yugoslavia, and in pressure on Israel to give up land to the Palestinians. Further, Eskin blames US liberals for exporting leftist, multi-culturalist ideas and destroying traditionalist values all over the world. As Eskin told me in an email exchange:

I saw in the past and I see today US conservatives as close allies and dear friends. Unfortunately, the foreign policy of the USA and the world policy of economic and pop-culture expansion are prevailing and not the ideas of US patriots. But I hope for the day when the school of the late Jesse Helms will dominate US politics and we will be your real allies.

Eskin characterizes the current multi-culturalist consensus as the sign of what is known in Judaism as the *erev rav* (the mixed multitude), a time of widespread immorality and deracination, when individuals devoid of all tradition and values are in power. Avigdor Eskin is also active in the Eurasia movement of Russian traditionalist conservative philosopher Alexander Dugin, whose ideas are strongly influenced by Alain De Benoist of the French New Right. The Eurasianists believe in an alliance between traditionalist Christians, Jews, and Muslims (especially Shi'ites and Sufis) against the "Atlanticist" leftist-liberal-neocon ideology represented by the rulers of the US and the EU. Dugin believes in a greater Russia that will be closely allied with Iran, to which peripheral territories like Ukraine, Abkhazia, and South Ossetia will be

annexed. Dugin's views led the Hoover Institution's John Dunlop to accuse him of "fascism." Of course, Eskin, as a committed Zionist, does not agree with all of Dugin's ideas; for example, Dugin's support for anti-Israel regimes like Venezuela and Iran. However, Eskin has always been strongly pro-Russian. He argues that Israel needs to be more closely allied to Russia and end its "passionate attachment" to the US. He argues that Israel should deal with the US from the position of a strong independent state, not that of a heavily subsidized and groveling military colony. Needless to say, Eskin's uncompromising views raised the ire of both Israeli and Western liberals. Eskin characterizes the current climate in the West thus:

Unfortunately, there is no full freedom of speech in the West today. The liberals feel their intellectual impotence and simply silence those who try to tell the truth.

The Israeli authorities had harassed Eskin ever since the mid 1990s, when he dared to criticize the secular saint of Israeli society, Yitzhak Rabin, and campaigned against the Israeli surrender of the West Bank and Gaza to Yasser Arafat's PLO. In 2000, Eskin was declared persona non grata and deported from the US, most likely at the suggestion of the Israeli government and its US supporters. In 2001, Eskin was accused of plotting to bombard the al-Aqsa mosque with pig heads, to place a pig's head on the tomb of Palestinian guerrilla Izz'ed-Din al-Qassam, who fought against the Jews and the British in the 1930s, and to set fire to the offices of a far-left Israeli organization. Based on the allegedly torture-induced "confessions" of another right-wing activist, Eskin was sent to jail for two and a half years. He was placed in the same cell with a convicted rapist and an Ethiopian immigrant serving time for beheading his wife. During the first months of his imprisonment, Eskin was forced to sleep on the floor because the prison administration claimed they could not find a bunk for him. After worldwide protests, especially vocal in Russian nationalist circles, eg Eskin's friend Alexander Dugin, Eskin's prison conditions were somewhat improved. Even now, Avigdor Eskin is subject to periodic campaigns of harassment from the Israeli authorities. Eskin is not afraid to acknowledge the large role Jews have had in left-wing and liberal movements worldwide. He had the following to say on the issue, echoing the late Rabbi Kahane:

Most of the Jews in the West are not observant and far from being ardent Zionists. So, it is natural that a person who has no national and traditional identity cannot understand the people who do have it. The solution is very simple. All the Jews must be encouraged to go home to Israel.

Unlike many other right-wing activists, Avigdor Eskin is optimistic about the future of Israel and the West as a whole. He concluded his email exchange with me by predicting the inevitable weakening of the Arab world, the end of US dependence on Arab oil, and the victory of Israel. Given his experience as a

believing Orthodox Jew, the survivor of both communist and Politically Correct oppression, Eskin's optimism is understandable, if idealistic.

Can we confirm Eskin was elected to the leadership Council of 'Eurasia'? Well, Grigory Nekhoroshev wrote (16) in *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* on Apr 24 2001:

In the Central council were elected representatives of culture: publicist Avigdor Eskin, writer Yuri Mamleev, TV journalist Mikhail Leontyev, Ambassador Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation in Uzbekistan Dmitri Ryurikov, Taltat Tadzhuiddin etc.

Maxim Sevchenko wrote in the same paper (17):

Among the others, also sounded the greeting message from the Israeli movement "Be'ad Artzeinu". Let's remind that it gained notoriety as an organization invoking total war against Arabs and Muslims in the territory of Palestine. Its members are so radical by words and deeds, that even the Israeli justice condemned some of them for the profanation of Muslim sacred places and vandalism against Muslim tombs. The message was signed by the leaders of this radical nationalist Zionist party: rabbi Avram Shmulevich, the "political emigrant" Avigdor Eskin, and the journalist, editor of the Internet version of "NG", Alexander Sherman. The movement "Be'ad Artzeinu" was introduced to the congress as one of the major collaborators of "Eurasia" on the side of Judaism and "Israeli traditionalism". Let's remind that the same Mr Avigdor Eskin, paying homage to the Congress, was convicted by the Israeli court for instigation to throwing pork heads on territory of al-Aqsa mosque and profanation by pork remnants of the tomb of a dead fighter of the Palestinian Resistance movement, which radical Zionists and their friends in the Russian media call no differently than "terrorist".

Mark Sedgwick (18) says:

Be'ad Artzeinu in 2002 claimed several hundred members, all of Russian origin. Two of its leaders were in Moscow for the founding congress of the Eurasia movement, Rabbi Avrom Shmulevich and Avigdor Eskin, both Israeli citizens of Russian origin. The Neo-Eurasianist approach to the Palestinian question is well illustrated by the activities of Avigdor Eskin, another Hebron settler of Russian origin, an associate of Shmulevich, and a member of Dugin's Eurasia movement. Shmulevich and Eskin are Neo-Eurasianists rather than Traditionalists, and even their Neo-Eurasianism is a consequence rather than a cause of their other activities. Eskin's stance preceded by the development of Neo-Eurasianism, and his first known

political activity was in 1979, when, at age 19, he and three other young settlers were arrested for breaking into Palestinian houses in Hebron, where they "overturned furniture and assaulted inhabitants." Three years later, in 1981, Eskin was again arrested, this time during a protest in front of Soviet airline Aeroflot's offices in New York, and charged with "rioting, unlawful assembly, disorderly conduct and attempted criminal mischief."

This is Eskin, so awful as to be perversely entertaining:

Reuters, May 28 1997 – Avigdor Eskin, the man who put a curse on Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin a month before he was assassinated, was convicted in an Israeli court on Wednesday of violating the Prevention of Terrorism Act. According to local news reports at the time, Eskin stood outside Yitzhak Rabin's house on the eve of Yom Kippur 1995 and cursed him with the ancient curse of *pulsa denura*, Aramaic for "lashes of fire." The curse read in part: "And on him, Yitzhak, son of Rosa, known as Yitzhak Rabin, we have permission to demand from angels of destruction that they take a sword to this wicked man to kill him, for handing over the Land of Israel to our enemies." Jerusalem District Court spokesman Moshe Gorali told Reuters: "The conviction relates to the interview he gave on television, in which he said the curse generally worked within 30 days. This was judged to constitute incitement to violence. He will be sentenced next week." The Justice Ministry said he could receive a maximum sentence of six years.

Feb 6 1998 – Jewish extremist Avigdor Eskin was released on bail last week by a decision of an Israeli court. Avigdor Eskin, who was accused of planning to throw the head of a pig wrapped in pages of the Qur'an inside al-Aqsa mosque, atop Jerusalem's Temple Mount, made bail of 1/2 million shekels on Jan 21 1998.

Oct 18 1999 – Jewish extremist Avigdor Eskin was convicted last Tuesday of placing a pig's head on the Muslim grave of 1930s Palestinian nationalist fighter Izz'ed-Din al-Qassam. The Jerusalem District Court, however, found insufficient evidence that Eskin was guilty of conspiring to catapult a pig's head into the al-Aqsa mosque. No date has been set for sentencing, but prosecutors will allegedly ask that Avigdor Eskin serve jail time for his pork-related crimes.

Nov 19 1999 – Jewish extremist Avigdor Eskin was sentenced to 2-1/2 years in jail today for placing a pig's head on the grave of Palestinian nationalist fighter Izz'ed-Din al-Qassam. The court last week also gave Avigdor Eskin an 18-month suspended sentence for conspiring to torch offices belonging to Israeli peace activists. Eskin was cleared of charges of plotting to catapult a pig's head onto the Temple Mount. On Nov 12, Avigdor Eskin was sentenced to two years in jail for "orchestrating" the placing of a pig's head on the grave of Izz'ed-Din al-Qassam.

Afterword

I'd like to add a few words here which I have left to the end so as not to confuse the general train of thought. In the Foreword, I mentioned Dugin's attitude to Putin and to the Russian Orthodox Church, and I also mentioned the Lubavitchers. I would like to fill in here with a memoir by a Ukrainian Reform Jewish organiser who had the misfortune to fall under the wheels of the Lubavitch take-over of Jewish organisations throughout the FSU. So disgruntled was he that he wrote a remarkably revealing memoir (19), which like everything else in this essay I rescued from oblivion, in this case from a now-defunct Russian Orthodox Christian web page. The burden of it is that Putin is pretty much in the pocket of the "Lubavitcher werewolves", as he calls them, and this may very well be true. The other thing I want to leave with you, which may seem quite paradoxical given the immediately preceding, is a US Lubavitch page for Noahides (20), that is to say, non-Jews who wish however humbly to attach themselves to the skirts of the Jews and improve their spiritual station thereby. The paradox is that this page is the most dementedly anti-Russian thing one could easily imagine. It isn't just anti-Communist, it's anti-Russian, because it denies that Russia has ever stopped being Communist. The author, Boruch (Bryan) Ellison, is clearly not an official Lubavitch spokesman, but he has the support (21) and endorsement (22) of a very large number of Lubavitcher Rabbis, and can be taken as a valid representative of the right wing of the Lubavitcher movement in the US, and he is not disavowed by Lubavitcher officialdom, any more than are the Lubavitcher wildcat messianists currently running many of the most violent religious settler communities in the Palestinian West Bank. So, what we have here is a global Lubavitcher discourse which is as bent as a corkscrew. It may well be that only Jews can get away with this sort of media ju-jitsu, because Jews, and especially Jewish organisations like Lubavitch, enjoy a sort of charmed life. But the reason I mention it is that I want to set Jewish religious politics firmly in the context of the global, corporate Right, as opposed to the sort of anarcho-fascist apocalypse that one might imagine from Dugin's discourses. I dare say the same argument could be made regarding Evola's post-WW2 recruits in Italy, but this requires a separate discussion.

URLs for plaintext readers

- (1) <http://www.4pt.su/en>
- (2) <http://www.endofthepresentworld.com/>
- (3) <http://www.amazon.co.uk/gp/product/0946222096/>
- (4) <http://www.evrazia.info/article/4271>
- (5) <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YSy6ENVAJLY>
- (6) http://web.archive.org/web/20030211055026/http://utenti.lycos.it/ArchivEurasia/dugin_jews.html
- (7) http://web.archive.org/web/20011230013942/http://utenti.tripod.it/ArchivEurasia/dugin_israel.html

- (8) http://web.archive.org/web/20020617114126/http://utenti.lycos.it/archiveurasia/eurasia_210401.html
- (9) <http://www.zarodinu.org/>
- (10) http://web.archive.org/web/20020617110411/http://utenti.lycos.it/archiveurasia/shmulevic_jwru.html
- (11) http://web.archive.org/web/20020214214402/http://utenti.tripod.it/ArchivEurasia/shmulevic_zavtra.html
- (12) http://web.archive.org/web/20020617114152/http://utenti.lycos.it/archiveurasia/shmul_ng010405.html
- (13) http://www.yitchakrabin.com/Barry%20Chamish/html/avigdor_eskin.html
- (14) <http://www.vdare.com/articles/avigdor-eskin-and-the-national-question-in-israel>
- (15) <http://avigdor-eskin.com/>
- (16) http://web.archive.org/web/20021002070111/http://utenti.lycos.it/ArchivEurasia/levkin_congress.html
- (17) http://web.archive.org/web/20021002070111/http://utenti.lycos.it/ArchivEurasia/levkin_congress.html
- (18) <http://www.zarodinu.org/site/sedgwick.htm>
- (19) <https://nignaq.wordpress.com/2009/03/05/selected-reminiscences-of-eduard-hodos/>
- (20) http://www.noahide.com/plo_updates/plo12_0226.htm
- (21) http://www.plo.attacreport.com/procl_1.php
- (22) http://www.plo.attacreport.com/response_list.php?procl_num=1

Share this:

Dugin in Shanghai China in International Relations

“China in International Relations: Geopolitics, Globalization, and Hegemony”

Author: Alexander Dugin

Transcript prepared by Jafe Arnold

Lecture #4 delivered at the China Institute of Fudan University, Shanghai, China, December 2018 [VIDEO]

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.39.20 PM.png

Today's lecture will be dedicated to Chinese identity in different fields of science. In the first lecture I explained the main structure of the science of international relations, the main concepts, theories, schools, and debates. In the second lecture I explained what geopolitics is. We have explored the geopolitical vision of Sea Power vs. Land Power. In the third lecture I explained multipolarity and multipolar theory, which insists that there should be more than 4 poles, or at least 4 poles – the US, China, Russia, and Europe – and not only one, Western pole. Today, I will try to put China in all of these fields of research in order to better understand what modern China is in these three contexts.

We are going to study the main, most important, or I would say central question: What is China? But we cannot start from the parts in order to come to the whole, because we cannot understand the meaning of the parts without knowledge of the whole. We cannot proceed in the opposite way either, because we do not know the whole. We need to use the philosophical method of hermeneutics in order to discover what China is through the process. We do not know what China is – nobody knows. China is a mystery. We are not going to reveal or explain this mystery, but we are going to enter this mystery, to try and think about Chinese identity, and put China's identity into different philosophical, geopolitical, and intellectual contexts, to find China's place in the world, but at the same time to define what China is here. The world is presumed to be whole, while China is only a part, but without knowing what China is or what the world is, we cannot find the place. We are going to proceed together in this hermeneutic approach from Schleiermacher.

We should establish some hypothesis on what China is, after which we can make a kind of reality-check. This is not a dogmatic definition of China, but a kind of presumption or phenomenological approach. In order to understand this, we need to make some very important statements. Every statement here is of crucial importance.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.39.30 PM

China is a civilization. That means not whole Civilization, obviously, as there are civilizations outside of China. China is one of the many civilizations. Being a civilization, China represents something complete and perfect, autonomous, and self-sufficient. To be a civilization means to have one's own measure inside, not outside. A civilization can measure its control and define its own values, progress or failure, using its own tools. Civilization means many things. It is the highest point of more complex, integral concepts. It is something that Professor Zhao Tingyang, whom I met in Beijing and I have a great impression of, means by Tianxia (天下). Tianxia (天下) is not a country, it is a system or civilization.

In geopolitics, China is a Big Space. For example Canada, which is a big country, is not a big space, because it could not represent this space as unified, centralized, historically united. North America is a big space, not Canada. Not every geographical big space is a geopolitical big space, but China is. China historically controls a big geographical zone that is united politically, socially, culturally, historically, religiously, by writing, by Han identity, and so on.

China is a culture. Chinese culture is more than the Chinese state, because the people of Taiwan and some non-Chinese, non-Han people share more or less the same culture, such as the Vietnamese, the Koreans, and partly the Japanese. Their identities and cultures were formed under the huge impact and influence of Chinese culture. Chinese culture is something supra-Chinese, something more than Chinese, because this culture can be given to others, and they can share this culture, such as the writing system for example.

China is a power, because it has political, economic, demographic, geopolitical, strategic, and military resources. It can oblige others to do something. If someone wanted to attack China, China could respond in any way. China is a power that can defend its sovereignty.

China is a pole in the multipolar system. I will explain later what concretely this means. When we are speaking about multipolarity, we immediately imagine the Western pole without any doubt as to it

being a civilization, power, and big space. But next to the West today, China is also immediately a most important pole in the world.

China is hegemony, but obviously China is not the only hegemony, or leading force. There are other hegemonies outside of China. China is a regional hegemony. It could lead and exercise leadership in some circle around China beyond its borders, but not too far. In some definite space, the same with culture, civilization, and power, China is a kind of center of hegemony that, compared to other countries that are close to China, is a real leading force.

China is an empire, not only in the traditional sense, but also in the idea of unifying national, political units. An empire is not one political state, but something more – a system. Tianxia (天下) can be mentioned here. It is something that unites more than one political subject and can expand its influence over greater space.

Thus, finally, China is Tianxia (天下).

All of these definitions should not be considered in an absolute sense, as all these definitions can be applied to China only if we add “one of several, not unique.” It is one civilization, but there are others. It is one big space, but there are others. It is a culture, but there are other cultures. China is a power, but there are other powers. China is a pole, but there are certainly other poles. China is hegemony, but there are other hegemonies. China is an empire, but there are other empires. That is precisely what we argued with Zhao Tingyang concerning the meaning of Tianxia (天下). I will explain later, but the idea in my opinion, the point of divergence with Zhao Tingyang is that China is one possible Tianxia (天下), not the only one, as there are other global structures. For example, there is the American concept of a global world; there can be imagined the multipolar concept of a global world, and there is one Chinese investment in globalization in the form of a universal organization based on the Tianxia theory (天下体系). We need to understand this project as one of several. Zhao Tingyang, who is the founder and author of Tianxia theory (天下体系), has said that his concept has been hijacked by some American professor who has written a book on the American Tianxia. According to this professor, only the American Tianxia is the real Tianxia and China’s is only a provincial version. This means that you can propose your global system, but you cannot be sure that it will be accepted by everybody else, at least theoretically. There is a fight for Tianxia (天下). This is already important because American scholars are beginning to borrow Chinese concepts – that is a very great and positive sign, a real sign of multipolarity.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.39.36 PM

The identity of traditional China can be summed up with other definitions. We are speaking about cultural identity. The Yin-Yang system (陰陽) is based on some important sentences, axes, or laws. Relations are more important than ontological units. It is not of importance what is one thing and what is another, but how they relate to each other – relations and the relativity between two things, rather than these things themselves, because there is no eternal essence. It is not essentialism. Things are changing and relations between them are changing as well. But relations are more stable than things themselves. That is a completely non-Western vision. The Western vision is that things or essences are much more important than relations. Relations could change, but things not. China is quite the opposite. Nature can be flexible, but relations stay. That is the Yin-Yang (陰陽) concept of relations. That is the Yin-Yang (陰陽) vision. Relations are eternal. Harmony should prevail. Harmony is balance, not the victory of Yin over Yang or Yang over Yin. There is no radical opposition between them. There is a kind of play. All oppositions are relative.

Order is based on ethics more than power. Ethics is the highest of things; it is balance and the recognition of the rules of the “play.” Ethics are not a result of the balance of power, as in the Western attitude. There is neither pure subjectivity nor pure objectivity. This is an application of the concept that relations prevail. There is no Western Cartesian subject, nor Western object. There is something subjective in nature, in human culture. You cannot trace here such a radical dividing line as in Western culture. That is why you, Chinese, have such a great admiration for stones. Stones are made by nature. You see the subjective element in stones, for example in Confucius’ temple here in Shanghai which I’ve visited here with Dr. Wang Pei. These stones are considered to be works of art, because nature is the artist, and man is a little bit of nature.

The Dao (道) is everywhere and nowhere. You cannot say that there is a God, Beauty, or a most important value. When you show your ideal, you lose it. When you speak the word, you lose the word. This is a kind of appreciation of silence. As Dr. Pei Wang has reminded, if you listen to silence properly, you can hear the sound of thunder. If you say that the Dao (道) is everywhere or just nowhere, that is a lie. The Dao (道) is outside, as the highest value that encompasses and surrounds everything and is at the center of the thing. It is relational.

Matter and spirit form a kind of “fold.” You can go the way of matter and come into the spirit. There is no strict dividing line between soul and body, because matter and spirit are not in opposition, but are relative. They are something that you cannot define radically as in “here is the body, and there is the soul.” They are intermingled in some way. So there is not only care for the body, because in caring about your body, you are caring about your soul, and vice versa. That is the Tai Chi (太極拳) principle. This is the Chinese way of understanding things.

The prevailing symmetry in Chinese identity is the Center vs. Periphery, not Top vs. Bottom. At the center is the Yellow Emperor Huangdi (黃帝) and there is the periphery. But there is no radical opposition between Top vs. Bottom. Rather it is a matter of concentration and degrees of ontological concentration.

Extremities are dangerous. When you come to the extreme, you lose relations with the whole. Going to extremes, you can lose relations with Being, the Dao (道), harmony, and the game of proportions.

Time is circular; it is not linear. The year starts again exactly at the same point where you begin, the New Year.

There is inclusiveness, not exclusiveness.

These are the main characteristics of Chinese identity. When we go to Western identity, we lose something important, these two points: the Yin and Yang.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.39.42 PM

We are coming to a radical dualism that is completely different from Chinese identity. If we try to describe the Western, not Chinese, we will see almost immediately totally different sentences: relations are secondary, and essences are of more importance; competition and struggle, not harmony, should prevail; all oppositions are radical and irreducible. There cannot be an intermediary term between, for example, Good and Evil. There is a dividing line in all the structure of this non-Chinese identity. Order is based on power, not on ethics. Power comes first, while ethics is of secondary importance. There is pure subjectivity and/or pure objectivity – all systems of Western thought are based either on subjective idealism, which in its radical form denies the reality of the external world, or objective materialism, in which case the subject is regarded only as a reflection or mirror of matter. The subject and object are always outside of Chinese culture and philosophy.

Transcendence with God or without God. Transcendence is the absence of something common between the creator and creation. That is a basic aspect of monotheistic religion: God is transcendent, which

means that he is incompatible with reality. Only God is; reality is not. In the materialist version, there is the same, only reality is; God does not exist. That is the modern version of the same transcendental attitude. In the modern sense, only material reality exists. As Nietzsche has said, God is dead – we have killed him. So transcendence at the same time prevails in the normal monotheistic theology of Western religions, or without them.

Matter and spirit are two natures. That is an absolute principle of Western identity.

In terms of symmetry, there is the top and the bottom, hierarchies, and taxonomies of different kinds, in which everything is included only based around the vertical line. The top is everything; the bottom is nothing. The top is Paradise or Heaven; the bottom is Hell.

Extremities are constitutional and very important in Western identity, because they create the space, because they go first.

Time is linear. Time is an arrow. Time is not seasons, but is an event that can never, or very rarely, be repeated. The difference between the event and the season is that an event does not repeat.

Exclusiveness, not inclusiveness, means that you organize reality by making strong differentiations between elements. The only way to understand something is to analyze it. What is analyzing in Greek? It is division, separation. To understand a thing, you should kill it and separate it apart, and afterwards try to re-combine and revive the dead system.

That is duality. Chinese culture is non-duality. This is important, because this means that Chinese identity is clearly not Western, but is also not sub-Western or would-be-Western. It is a completely different world organized on a different basis.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.39.47 PM

Now we see how deep Chinese identity is. When we speak about the China State, 中国(Zhōngguó), we can say that there is a national identity supported by the Chinese state. This means that the things I

have mentioned exist only because of the state, the Confucianist state, the Imperial state, the Communist state – through all of Chinese history, there was a state that promoted these values, the values of Chinese culture, with an educational system, traditions, and way of life – everything was based on these continuations of Chinese identity. But when we go to China Town (唐人街) in the West, there is no China State. There is no necessity to follow this route by going abroad, and one can easily accept the values of other cultures. Sometimes there are no obstacles. But in Washington, in modern days – I was there in 2005 – near the White House, there is a huge Chinatown where everyone is Chinese – with Chinese restaurants, Chinese names, Chinese food, and Chinese speaking Chinese. They are not obliged; there is no state obliging them to be Chinese, but they prefer to stay Chinese. So here we have something more than an artificially constructed identity. We have something deeper than that. If we say that by changing the Chinese state, you will receive another culture, then Chinatown is a great example that this is not so simple. Sometimes Chinese live abroad 10, 20, sometimes 30 years, return to China and they are totally devoted to the Communist Party, to Chinese identity and Confucianism.

That is the great resistance of identity. Identity is not only about the state, nationality, and education; it is much deeper. Chinese identity can be preserved, developed, affirmed, and conserved in different situations and societies. Between the Chinese in China and the Chinese abroad, there is an important dialectical relationship. Chinese identity could exist outside of the state, and if you were to ask Chinese outside what kind of order they prefer, they will almost totally prefer the Chinese order and way of life. That is existential. “Chinese” is defined by Chinese culture, not by the outside, external structure of the state or society. The meaning of Chinese identity is such that it is already included in it. Outside, things can change, while inside there can be a balance – this is the relations-state. For example, you could modernize some part of your society, but other parts will be more conservative, in order to preserve the balance. That is flexible, not radical; this is an inclusive, relations-based, and very stable Chinese identity. It is eternal, like the seasons, or the Mandate of Heaven – you could lose such with one emperor or system, but you will certainly find it with another. You can return to the same point and start the next cycle, the next year.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.39.54 PM

What we get from this analysis, this comparison of the China State and Chinatown, is that Chinese identity is deeper than both. The China state, and the Chinese living outside of China, have a main, common denominator. I call this the Chinese Dasein (汉的此在). Dasein (此在) is Heidegger's term. I do not think we should use here the concept of Zhōngguó (中国) because it is too political, national, or related to the State. We should use here Han (汉), that is precisely the core of the Chinese Dasein (汉的此在). You can transform into Han nomads from the North or the population of the South of China, but Han is the core of Chinese identity. Han-Being is existential and ontological.

We can describe the Chinese Dasein (此在) using Heidegger's methods in terms of Being-Chinese. You cannot be without being Chinese first. Being Chinese, you understand what Being means for Chinese, but without that you have no access to this existential understanding. Being-in-the-World, Im-der-Welt-Sein, is translated here as Being-in-the-Chinese-World. The Chinese world does not mean Zhōngguó (中國), the Chinese State, but is the world you interpret, see, and create over the course of this interpretation. You can live in a Chinese world while living inside or outside of China. Being-With, Mit-Sein in German, another concept of Heidegger's, is the core of Chinese identity, as you cannot be alone, but always surrounded by other Chinese. You are with your family, ancestors, with the Other, the Chinese writing system, your thoughts. That is the Chinese dialogue. You are always with. With what? With something Chinese.

Being-Toward-Chinese-Death is the most radical definition of Being-Here, or Dasein (此在). I once told the last living disciple of Heidegger, Professor Friedrich von Hermann in Freiburg, that I believe in a multiplicity of Daseins – there is not only one universal Dasein for everybody, because there are different cultures and their own different descriptions of Being-Here. He said that Heidegger would not approve of that, because Heidegger believed in the universality of Dasein (此在), and the argument for such is the universality of Death. I responded: Not at all! In different cultures, there are different deaths. For atheists, death is the end of everything. For Christians, the way of death is based on the soul and post-mortem journey into Heaven and Paradise. These are completely different experiences. I think that there is or should be a Chinese understanding of Death inscribed in the Chinese culture of the return of the ancestors. The family, the house, the tradition are more important than Death. Entering into Death or coming to the world, there is this circular rotation. It is not a kind of interruption of continuity. There is continuity in Death. There could be a Chinese Death, a very special one. Being Russian, I could speak more about the Russian meaning and way of Death, but I leave it to you to explore this existential of Chinese Dasein (此在) more.

As for the Chinese Logos, this is a more evident part of Chinese identity because it is explicit. If existential identity is implicit, or hidden on the existential, basic level of presence in the world, then the Logos is quite clear. In traditional society, we have the Chinese Logos with Confucius, Laozi, and Chinese Buddhism – these are the three great systems of Chinese culture and traditional society. Tianxia (天下) is precisely a traditional concept, not imagined by Professor Zhao Tingyang. In the Zhuangzi text there is a chapter called "Tianxia." It is the 33rd and the last in traditional division of the whole book (Miscellaneous Chapters — 雜篇 Zapan).

Ethical order and meritocracy. Professor Daniel Bell has written a very interesting book on the Chinese model of meritocracy, which I recommend – “The China Model: Political Meritocracy and the Limits of Democracy”.[1]

And so, there are very explicitly developed systems of how to understand the basic identity on the level of Logos. All the definitions we used in the beginning can be found here, very rich, with details, in books, systems, and schools. This is a huge cultural and intellectual heritage based on Chinese identity.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.02 PM In modern society you have another form of the Chinese Logos: Mao Zedong, socialism, and Chinese modernity are a kind of new form of the Chinese Logos adapted to new challenges in your history. In your present situation, this is just as important as the heritage of traditional Chinese identity. These are new names for things. Confucius said that we need to improve the names of things. Mao Zedong has improved some names to adapt them to reality without destroying relations between things, while continuing the same Chinese identity. In this situation, Deng Xiaoping added to this vision some new features, such as opening to the West – but not in order to give up your identity, but with the flexibility to empower your identity, to stay Chinese in the new global world.

It is not globalization that is using China. It is China that is trying to use globalization. This is very interesting, but very dangerous, because in coming into a world that is not Chinese and is organized on a completely different set of concepts and values, it is easy to lose identity. Maybe not for you, as we have discovered that your identity is so strong that you can accept this challenge. This is the difference between Chinese and Russian history. Russian identity is not so strong. Coming to meet the West, we have failed, we lost our country, and almost lost our soul. In the last moment, Putin appeared. Our situation was extremely critical in the 1990's, and entering into globalization, we accepted it too deeply, we let it enter too deep into our system and it almost destroyed our society.

Now we are coming to future Chinese society, what I call the Great Synthesis of the traditional and modern society. That is precisely what Comrade Xi Jinping declares. He declares the Chinese Dream. China's Dream is not only an imitation of the American dream, with consumption and comfort, but is a dream to re-affirm your eternal identity in new conditions, to join traditional society with its values and modern society. It is precisely Confucianism and Maoism – the traditions of ancient China and modern China. That is a kind of Chinese post-modernity or Chinese future. That is the Logos based on Chinese Dasein (此在).

In order to reinforce and empower this Logos for future Chinese identity, you could use some European authors who are very critical of the European Logos and European Modernity, which are very useful to promoting your understanding of the West.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.09 PM

René Guénon, the founder of Traditionalism, and his defense of sacred tradition and radical critique of modernity are important to defending your traditional values, such as Daoism, Buddhism, and all the traditions of your society. It is a defense of Traditional society.

You can use Martin Heidegger's new or fundamental ontology, which is already being done in Chinese society as I have remarked with great pleasure, and I am happy that Heidegger is very well known here. That is something incredibly rich and important.

Carl Schmitt's political realism helps with reading many different aspects of Western political thought.

I would also recommend the ideas of the New Right, Eurasianism, Geopolitics, the sociology of hierarchy (first of all the French sociologist Louis Dumont), and the concept of Conservative Revolution.

The Great Synthesis should include revolutionary and traditional elements. These are all considered more or less on the Right, but as for the Left, I think that anti-capitalism and the anti-capitalist ethics of Karl Marx are extremely important, maybe not the technical aspects of his thought which is a little outdated. Anti-imperialism is an important concept as well. Mao Zedong, as the founder of Chinese socialism, included the peasantry and traditional society in the revolutionary class, whereas in Russia Lenin excluded the peasants from the revolutionary class. That was the reason for the near genocide of the Russian people. You were much more clever.

And I suggest Antonio Gramsci, many of whose ideas, such as Caesarism, are very important now and applicable to the present situation. The historical pact of intellectuals and Gramsci's concept of hegemony, are of use as well.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.14 PM The next step is China in International Relations.

Liberalism in IR is based on the full spectrum-domination of Western values. We should not mistake this situation. All the classical theories of Liberalism in IR are based on the idea that Liberal Western values should prevail on the global level. You have no chance to have Chinese identity or Chinese sovereignty within this concept, because Liberalism in IR explicitly thinks that there should be the dissolution of the nation-states, the dissolution of all forms of collective identities in favor of only one type of identity – the individual – and that there should be an international structure or institution over states whose authority should be recognized as law.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.19 PM

That would mean the end of China not only as a state, but also Chinatown – the end of Chinese identity as a community. Sooner or later, the liberals will remark that the Chinese prefer their cultural identity, and they will attack that, try to destroy it. This is not religious because all the religions of the West are more or less destroyed already by Liberalism in the West. When the Liberals remark that there is something not so much Western and individualistic with Chinese identity, then they will begin to attack not only the state, but also Chinese culture.

Liberalism in IR excludes China. It is unadaptable. It is a projection of Western hegemony, the Western system of values, and unipolar model which, in the eyes of Liberals, should be imposed on a global scale.

Realism in IR is Western-centric and modern, but at least it recognizes the right of China to preserve her sovereignty. Realism does not enter into the details of civilization. Civilization does not matter to realists. But realists think that if there is a power that can defend itself, then we should take it into consideration. That is a little better than Liberalism. They will compete with you, maybe fight, maybe conclude an alliance or peace, but a priori this is not planned destruction [of China] as in Liberalism.

Marxism in IR is completely different from what you might think. It is not the idea of Soviet or Chinese international politics. Marxism in IR is based on the idea that all nation-states should be dissolved and global capitalism should prevail; there should be the destruction of all societies, and the transformation of humanity into two classes with no nation, identity, state, or type of civilization. This is cosmopolitanism. The global population is made into a mixture of cultures, peoples, ethnic groups to create a post-national, post-ethnic, post-national confusion of all races and ethnic groups, in order to

divide them into two classes: the global proletariat and global bourgeoisie. That is applied to IR by authors such as Wallerstein.

In Wallerstein's global system, there should be the transformation of the global world with one center of developed countries and the periphery of underdeveloped countries. In between them, China, Russia, India, Brazil, and the semi-periphery, should be destroyed, but the oligarchic, capitalist part of these semi-periphery countries should be integrated into the global elite, and the others should become more and more poor. Immigration is an ideological concept to promote this, a tool, to accelerate this process. Through mass migration, they will transform the world into a culturally homogenous structure with the only dividing line being between poor and rich – and after this will start the global proletarian revolution. Thus, in the short term, Marxists in IR serve the Liberals because they say that first capitalism should prevail. They regard Stalinism, Sovietism, Russian socialism, Chinese socialism, and Maoism not as authentic socialist experiments, but as kinds of "National Bolshevism" or "National Marxisms." They think that you do not have socialism, but a kind of national-bureaucratic, totalitarian state ruled by a political elite that should be destroyed. Marxists in IR are not friends. Beware of these "Marxists" and "Leftists." They are a Fifth Column of Liberals in IR. China has nothing to do with them.

The English school is rather interesting – above all, the IR author Barry Buzan. The English school thinks that there should not be a global government, as the Liberals insist, but a set of rules established by a club. The most powerful countries should accept, as a club, some rules and relations that will be a kind of constitution of the club. A club is not an authority, but a matter of self-respect and social position, not something that you are obliged to follow. You are not obliged to follow the rules of the club, but it is "better" that you accept them to increase your status. The "great countries" of the G20 and G7 are a club. Their decisions are not obligatory, but are important to follow. If someone is thrown out of the club, as we, Russia, were after Crimea, we are supposed to feel "awkward" – not in the face of an authority that can punish us like a criminal, but in the face of a kind of "moral disapproval from the club." The English school of IR explains this perfectly.

Post-positivist theories are useful in order to deconstruct the Western imperialist narrative in IR. The post-positivists propose almost nothing, but their radical criticisms and deconstruction of discourse with post-modern tools are very useful when we have to defend our identity. It is a tool for defense and offense. If a Chinese specialist in IR can understand what post-positivist IR theories are all about, they will be completely free from any kind of complexes – they could speak with any Western critics of the Chinese system using their own tools. This is a marginal sector of IR that is growing in importance. I recommend above all two authors that should be carefully read and which are very important for Chinese IR in general: that is the Australian scholar now living in Great Britain, John Hobson, and his *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics*. He is anti-racist, rather left-wing and a Gramscianist, but his work is perfect, remarkable. He is accepted as a normal scholar, as not too much of a radical, but his

work is quite a miracle in its criticism of all kinds of IR theory based on the manifestation of Eurocentric and racist -isms. His offers the best criticism of racism that I have met in the field of IR. The next, maybe more technical author is Stephen Gill and his work, American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission, which is a Gramscian application of deconstruction to the temptation to create global government on the part of some American internationalist, liberal institutions.

You can use these two books in order to not only defend Chinese identity and politics, but as well to lead the intellectual attack on those who come and say that you have no human rights, no democracy, a totalitarian system, and so on. You can immediately cite a few pages from these two books and they will disappear, because their discourse against yours would be a defense of pure imperialism, racism, and nationalism. This is very important from a theoretical point of view.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.26 PM

There are some versions of Chinese International Relations theory. I think that there is a Chinese way of globalization. Professor Zhao Tingyang thinks that the global world and global governance should be organized based on the Tianxia principle. I don't believe in that, but it is a very good idea if you insist on your own globalism: "Let's hear what we, Chinese – strong, powerful, rich, a rising power – have to say with our own version of globalization." That is a very smart move and very interesting concept, but I hardly can imagine that the globalists who have a completely different understanding of what globalization is, could seriously speak about that.

The Chinese realism of Yan Xuetong as a concept is not pure realism. Yan Xuetong proposes that a realistic understanding of the balance of power, alliances, should include an ethical dimension, something completely unknown to realism. This is a kind of "moral realism" (王道外交) or "ethical realism". That is Chinese vision of realism in which there is not only the relation of powers, *badao*, but also an ethical dimension, *wangdao*.

As for the Chinese analysis of the British school, I could say that the China Model of Professor Zhang Weiwei is kind of that. "Let us have some rules for international behavior, some club, but do not impose on us your rule in an authoritarian way. We can hear you, we are open to debate and dialogue", and Professor Zhang Weiwei represents this brilliantly with his travels through the West. He perfectly well explains Chinese identity without letting others convince him or insisting too much on the Chinese truth. This English club-school way of promoting Chinese identity is very inclusive, mild, harmonious, polite, and Confucian.

One interesting idea of Qin Yaqing insists on the Guanxi concept that relations are more important than essences. We need first of all to concentrate on relations between countries and try to moderate relations and meta-relations without going into the essence of “good”, “bad”, “real power”, “pretending power”, etc. On the basis of relations, we can construct some specific balance for the system of IR.

So, while there is not yet a Chinese IR theory, but there are some fruitful approaches.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.30 PM

Now for China and geopolitics. In classical geopolitics, on Mackinder and Spykman’s maps, it is absolutely clear that China represents Rimland, the coastal area of Eurasia. All zones of Rimland are divided between the pivot area, Heartland, and Sea Power. But at the same time, Rimland, and such a huge part of Rimland as China, could have its own Heartland, its own continental core, next to its coastal component. China is its own world that could apply geopolitical principles to China herself. It is too great to be only a part of Rimland. It could also be an independent part of Heartland, having its own Rimland or coastal area. In traditional geopolitics, Heartland and Land Power are Tradition, and Sea Power is modernization. The same is in the case of China: China’s coastal area is much more modernized and involved in capitalism, while the inner part is more traditional.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.36 PM

China, as Rimland, is a zone in the balance of global power between two civilizational powers, Land Power and Sea Power, fighting together for control [over Rimland] from Europe through the Middle East and Central Asia to China. All of this region is a kind of zone for world rule.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.43 PM

There are two classical formula:

“Who controls Eastern Europe, controls Heartland; who controls Heartland, rules the World.” (Mackinder). This version of Mackinder’s was from the beginning of the 20th century.

In the middle of the 20th century, when the importance of other places of Rimland came to be understood in the process of de-colonization, another geopolitician and follower of Mackinder, Spykman, transformed this geopolitical formula:

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.48 PM

“Who controls Rimland, controls Heartland; who controls Heartland, rules the World.” (Spykman)

If Eastern Europe was the most important space to contend Heartland and Russia, according to Anglo-Saxon global politics, then Rimland is in a much broader sense, but with the same logic of the opposition between Sea Power and Land Power.

Now there is a formula for the 21st century, when China is the greatest power of Rimland:

“Who controls China, controls Rimland; who controls Rimland, controls Heartland; and who controls Heartland, rules the World.”

We have this new definition and formula because now that China is not an object, as Rimland was 60 or 70 years ago, and China is a giant, a rising power, it is no longer going to be controlled by external powers. It is quite out of the question and impossible in the present situation that Russia could pretend to control China, and there is no desire, will, resources, possibility, capacity, or ability to do so. The West, Sea Power, is also more and more understanding that it cannot control China.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.54 PM

Thus, maybe as Graham Allison says, there is a growing danger of confrontation precisely because the most important part of Rimland today is not controlled by the West. That is a serious challenge to Sea Power. That is Allison's interpretation of Thucydides Trap.[2]

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.40.59 PM

There is only one thing that could change. If China will recognize herself as Heartland, it will rule herself and maybe Rimland, and maybe thereby including the Russian Heartland, the world. But now we cannot imagine that as a result of occupation, expansion, imperialism, and so on. It is only free will, based on China's free decision. It is very interesting how the balance of geopolitics during the century has changed. I think that the rise of China changes everything.

China has a Land Power dimension (the North, West, rural area, Traditional Empire, and the Chinese Communist Party). China has a Sea Power dimension as well (the East, Coast, capitalism, trade, modernization, globalization, G-2 project). Going in the Sea Power direction, China could be part of the globalist construction. But there is also the core China, the Central China [the Middle Country, Middle Kingdom, Central] dimension of China that is precisely what unites the two sides of China – the Land Power and Sea Power. This is the key to the geopolitical future.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.05 PM

Western hegemony is represented in strategy, civilizational values, technology, liberal democracy, and universal type of social organization, such as cosmopolitanism and individualism and so on. Unipolarity is something that happened after the fall of the Soviet Union. In that moment, Fukuyama wrote his famous text on the End of History because, according to him, there was only one pole, one system, one hegemony, and no one at the time could imagine a challenge to it. That was the unipolar moment based on the clear domination of the West. That was not globalization as a sum of different cultures and peoples coming and living together and sharing values. The Western values – liberal democracy, global capitalism, individualism, cosmopolitanism, and the Western modern and post-modern liberal understanding of man – were taken as universal and imposed on everybody. The last formal power that fought against that, the Soviet union, had fallen. That was the logic of unipolarity.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.10 PM

The unipolar world leaves China as a civilization no place. The unipolar world gives a place to Chinese as individuals, but only as how they understand Chinese should be: they should be individuals striving for comfort, a career, good living, materialist standards, and being part of the global world with the same iPhone, jackets, interests, movies, entertainment, food. Chinese as individuals will be accepted as any other, but Chinese identity will be rejected. The password for the unipolar world is "I am an individual, let me in." You cannot join the unipolar world as Chinese individuals with all the baggage of your Dasein (此在), your existential ground, your Logos, your Communist Party, and Confucius.

This is the special exclusiveness of liberalism. The main book of modern Liberalism and Neo-Liberalism, is Karl Popper's *The Open Society and its Enemies*. There is class war in Marxism. There is race war in National Socialism. And there is the war between the Open Society and its Enemies in Liberalism. This is absolutely racist. If you are considered to be one of these enemies, you are out, you are excluded, you are called a fascist, communist, Stalinist, Maoist, and so on, the Gulag and Auschwitz and so on, you are just barbarians. You can enter only accepting what they think you should be, not what you are or want to be. They will try to control your desires, your will, your interests, your sympathies, choices, and demands. You should follow their rules, protocols, system, and only after that will you be a "friend of the Open Society." The Open Society is an exclusive concept.

What is the difference? Fascists regard other fascists positively. Communists can consider other communists friends. If liberals consider all other liberals friends, then this is the same. But fascists started to destroy the other races, considered to be un-human. The communists, in our experience, almost destroyed millions of our population, considering them to be bourgeois or not revolutionary. Liberals destroy the enemies of the liberal Open Society by bombing Libya, destroying Iraq, and so on. Everyone who is against the Open Society should be eliminated, destroyed, killed. That is nothing new, maybe something simply more or less human, but we should clearly understand what unipolarity and Western hegemony mean. They might be friendly, but they are hiding a knife. We should be aware of this in the very least.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.15 PM

Here we can see a soft version of unipolarity. The West proposes to the other powers, Europe and China, to be friends, as in the G2 or NATO concept. But what goes on in other parts of the world? Bloody chaos, civil wars, radical political and religious extremist forces, killings – as has already happened in North Africa. The same fate is destined for Russia in the writings of Zbigniew Brzezinski, who said that Russia should be Balkanized. When Bush was in Moscow once in the early 2000's, he said to Putin:

“Please wait, you will have the same democracy as in Iraq.” That was precisely when the US was in the process of killing hundreds of thousands of people there. Putin was very shocked because he somehow imagined Russia’s future differently. But that is the idea of what will go on outside of these zones – a kind of manipulated chaos.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.21 PM

There are three ways for China to deal with hegemony.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.27 PM

1. It could accept Western hegemony, which is not so strange, I think. Since Deng Xiaoping’s concept of transformation, there is some kind of threat of Chinese society going to deep into the consumer society, the Western way of life, and capitalism and globalization, towards finally accepting Western hegemony. If we do not care about Chinese identity, maybe accepting Western hegemony is the solution, or at least an option. If every Chinese accepts this global society, with some skills and talents allowed for the Chinese people, maybe there will be some solution, but there will be no Chinese identity. Some people care about Chinese identity and sovereignty; others don’t. I do not think that there are too many of them, but theoretically this could be so, because hegemony is not only the strategic domination of the West, it is also values and standards. So a liberal, pro-Western, pro-Popper, pro-Soros trend could be identified in Chinese society. I presume that there could be some educational structures, professors, and trends in cultures – maybe not dominating, because you have the Communist Party, the main guard of Chinese identity and the present Logos, and tradition. Nevertheless you have taken in a little poison, and poison can be active in some cases.

2. You can affirm and develop Chinese regional hegemony. That is the realist, nationalist trend. You could call this the badao, with wangdao adding an ethical dimension. That will be your Chinese way. But I think that this is the best way for China to consider hegemony. You could say that your hegemony is more or less in some area, maybe in some ways outside of Chinese borders and including other spaces, but you could also make differences – in one situation, political, in another economic, in a third hegemony could be cultural. Hegemony is not bad in itself. But the most important thing is to have a just model for hegemony. For that balance and harmony, Chinese culture has many experiences. Balance is a part of Chinese identity. Chinese hegemony could be based on your own character and identity, not on some universal rules of hegemony.

3. Lastly, you could try to put Chinese hegemony on a world scale, to propose a Chinese globalism. I have heard a kind of fear or idea among serious people in the US, the West, and Russia of the myth of Chinese globalization. Maybe you have no idea or project to impose hegemony on a world scale, but others think that you have such plans. You need to accept them, because if someone thinks that there is something, that means that on the social level there is something, maybe only in their minds, but that is how the world is shaped – by projections of our thoughts. You should not say that you have no such [hegemonic] idea. There are many people in different cultures who are absolutely sure that you have such ideas. You need to take that into consideration. If you know that there are such people, you will speak to them more carefully. You should somehow promote your version taking into consideration how they regard China.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.33 PM

The theory of the multipolar world, mostly developed by us in Russia, by the Eurasianist school and Russian school of geopolitics, means acceptance of differences between civilizations. Civilization is the main actor in IR, not the state. The difference here is of huge importance. For example, if we develop Huntington's idea and recognize that it is civilizations and big spaces that are the main actors, then we have a totally different vision of IR system which is not yet present in the manuals of IR. This is not only because it is at the first stage of development, but because it contradicts any kind of globalist, Western understanding.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.39 PM

What is civilization? Civilization is a relative absolute, or an aspect of the absolute. I would like to stress this. What does it mean to be an aspect of the absolute? It means to be absolutely absolute – but not alone. If you are fully, totally Chinese, you could understand something or someone who is not Chinese only if you have fulfilled this absolute dimension of identity. Then, from the center, not the outside, you can understand the Other. The only way to arrive at a real “globalization”, a real understanding of each other, is to start with ourselves. We cannot understand the Other if we do not understand ourselves. If we are not ourselves, we cannot deal properly with the Other. Then we would be only half Chinese, half Russian, half English, or half German. The real German should be based on the German Dasein (“Being-Here”), German Logos, German Tradition, German Identity. Only in the depth, core of this identity, can they understand others.

All problems are not in this deep realization of identity, but come when we start to pretend that we have already realized this identity, when we are only halfway along the path. People who enter a new religion are more radical and fanatic than people living in that religion for all their life. This is a kind of “too early” reaction. Nationalism, racism, xenophobia, the hatred of the Other, are possible only on the middle-path towards oneself. When we are arriving at ourself, we cannot be xenophobic, nationalist or racist. When we have fully realized our identity, our self, we are much more open to the other, because we consider, for example, that it is not only Russia that is absolute, but that by being more and more Russian, by discovering more and more the profound Russian identity, we are arriving towards the Absolute. Here, at that central point, we can meet the real, perfect, absolute Chinese. The Absolute Chinese meets Absolute Russian in the center of their civilization. We could compare Laozi or Confucius with Dostoyevsky or the Russian Orthodox Christian tradition. By realizing relative aspects of the absolute, we are coming to the meeting-point of civilizations – not outside, not being totally destroyed as a cultural unity and fragmented into individuals. Individuals cannot understand other individuals, because the pure individual is the most “primitive” form of being, totally limited to simplistic desires. The individual is like a robot, as a robot is a man without tradition or identity, a simulacrum of man.

Civilizations should be understood in the plural. There are Chinese, Russian, European, Islamic, African, Latin American, Western civilizations that can interact, peacefully coexist, try to exchange their identities. For example, to become Russian, you can come to Russia, learn our language, accept our values, if you want or you do not have to. This concept of civilization is therefore inclusive. But we cannot propose a single unique civilization for all of humanity. Maybe it will be the result of the Absolute, when everyone will go to the center of themselves, and we will arrive at the meeting-point of unique civilizations, but in order to do so we must make the long path within ourselves. That is the main meaning of the multipolar world.

A pole is a Big Space + civilization, an idea + power, autarchy + sovereignty, hegemony + culture, force + authority. These are the formal concepts for understanding what a pole in the multipolar world theory is.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.43 PM

So, what could be the Chinese version of the multipolar world? This means the application of the same principles to China's case. China is Identity + Sovereignty. If you stress sovereignty too much, you can lose identity, and if you stress only cultural identity, you could lose the practical capacity to defend your sovereignty. China should unite identity and sovereignty, and that is precisely what modern China is doing and what Xi Jinping wants to do. That is Greater China, the Chinese Dream.

China is a civilization, which must be affirmed. There is the danger that if you forget this, you will be treated as population, masses, and individuals. But you should educationally promote your civilization as such. You should call it a civilization.

China is a regional hegemony in South Asia and the Far East – and beyond, as long as your power, will, and capacity let you expand your hegemony. But such should be linked to your understanding of what is justice, what is balance. If you expand too much, you can overstretch your hegemony. Hegemony should be put in just limits. That was precisely our case. From time to time, Russia overstretched our empire and we couldn't manage. We should expand only within the limit in which we can assimilate, rule, manage, as well as develop our relations with the people who join us – we should always give them something, not humiliate them. I think that is important in dealing with Xinjiang and Tibet now. You should have them under your control, but you should understand them as the Other and include them somehow. That demands always updating and adjusting.

China is much more than a state, and that is where Zhao Tingyang's concept is of radical importance: affirming China as Tianxia. The growth of this Tianxia should be in harmony. You could say: let's not start with the global, but start with our region, let's install practically now the Belt and Road project, let's install it here, demonstrate how it works, and if humanity will be seduced by this Tianxia moment, maybe others will accept it. The importance is to start with China within your possible capacities to introduce this inclusive concept based on relations, justice, ethics, and hegemony. China should be recognized as a pole in all senses. There you have already the basic aspects of a Chinese version of multipolar world theory.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.48 PM

Here on this map we see the basic civilizations which could sooner or later be the poles of the multipolar world. Some of them are already present, such as the West, or European civilization if it will be affirmed as independent outside of globalist American hegemony, and there are the Eurasian, Chinese, and Islamic worlds – the latter of which is trying to affirm its identity, up to now not so successfully – and Africa. It is interesting that in South America multipolar thinking is very developed. There are many theorists there, many partisans of multipolar world theory and South or Latin American identity.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.53 PM

Chinese International Relations theory can be based on multipolarity. In that sense, all the other factors that I have already mentioned can play an important role. Tianxia theory applied on an original scale could create this constant pole. The theory of moral realism of Yan Xuetong could be as well applied not only to China as a country, but Chinese civilization, and here his idea of ethics plus power acquires its implicit meaning. There are also analogues of the British school, with the relativization of Western rules for the club in which China is supposed to impose rules in the club that China would like to be a member of. In the present situation, the G7 is a Western club which imposes rules that are alien to Chinese culture. Here Zhang Weiwei and Qin Yaqing's concepts can be very useful.

Here we can see a kind of beginning of the multipolar world in the form of 4+.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.41.59 PM

If China is on the side of Land Power, then the world order is already multipolar. We are not so far from multipolarity. If China chooses multipolarity, this is not necessarily an alliance with Russia. China could be Heartland herself, as Europe could be a continental Heartland as in classical geopolitics, and there is of course the Russian Heartland. These three heartlands could cooperate and create multipolarity very soon. This is an invitation to other civilizations as well.

And so, to end, the geopolitical axiom of the 21st century is: Who controls China, controls Rimland; who controls Rimland, controls Heartland; who controls Heartland, rules the World.

We, Russia, cannot change our position in geopolitical space. We can exist as Eurasia, as Heartland, or we could not exist. We have no choice. It is difficult for Europe to make a choice in the present situation with the present elites. The only great power that in the present situation can make a choice, and has enough power to do so, is China. China has the choice as Rimland. Heartland cannot. America cannot, although it is trying to get out of this globalization and Sea Power with Trump – not Trump himself, but his words and the votes for him – the American people tried to get out of this globalist concept, to reaffirm themselves as an American pole, not global. That is a very good sign. But now it is really only China that can make the choice.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.42.05 PM

There are three solutions or choices for China.

China can be controlled by the US/NATO. That means that the West will rule Rimland, Heartland, and the World. If the globalists manage to promote their control over China through globalization, through influence on the young generation, technology, global capitalism, and liberal theories, they could rule the world.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.42.10 PM

In the old version of geopolitics, China could be controlled by Russia (Heartland). This is absolutely impossible today. It was not so impossible in Tsarist times, or including in Soviet times, when Stalin tried to help Mao and Russia influenced China. But today there is no way, will, desire, possibility, or resources to do so. We cannot control China. China is so huge and developed that this is out of the question. Our weakness is therefore a very good thing for multipolarity. If you logically, rationally no longer fear Russia, you are free to accept us not as a threat, but as an ally, not as asymmetrical as before. The Turks have understood this. The Turks from time to time still commit some errors, but as they they have come to understand that Russia is no longer a threat, they have become “pro-Russian” oriented on many things. It would be great if China would learn this lesson.

Finally, China could be controlled by China herself. In that sense, China should emphasize its Heartland identity, its traditional identity represented today by the Communist Party's order in Chinese society.

Screen Shot 2019-02-04 at 9.42.17 PM

If the choice will be made in favor of China, that will mean multipolarity. On the one hand, there is the West that proposes its own system of values, identity, and civilization, while on the other hand there is the Russian Heartland, which does not propose anything a-symmetric. Russia does not propose anything, except that China Become China Again and to Make China Great Again.

Footnotes:

[1] Daniel A. Bell, *The China Model: Political Meritocracy and the Limits of Democracy*, Princeton University Press, 2015.

[2] Graham Allison, "The Thucydides Trap: Are the U.S. and China Headed for War?", *The Atlantic* (24/9/2015).

Dugin on Ethnicity vs. Race

GIULIANO ADRIANO MALVICINI

7,022 words

Aleksandr-Dugin-Cr-187x300

Since liberalism, as an ideology founded on the rights of the individual, calls for “the liberation from all forms of collective identity in general, [and is therefore] entirely incompatible with the ethnos and ethnocentrism, and is an expression of a systematic theoretical and technological ethnocide,” “ethnocentrism” and the positive affirmation of “ethnic” identity are viewed by Dugin as a potential base for resistance to liberalism. This is why he argues that “ethnocentrism” can be viewed as a positive component of National Socialism, if it is neutralized by purging it of any racial or national connotations.

Dugin’s notion of “ethnos” has nothing to do with race — he makes it very clear that it is a purely cultural, linguistic and sociological concept with no biological basis. As we shall see, Dugin’s concept of “ethnocentrism,” which he says is derived from the German sociologist Wilhelm Mühlmann (who, however, was a convinced National Socialist and racist — in the sense that he accepted the biological reality of race as a factor in the genesis of cultures), differs from the commonly accepted meaning of this term.

As for the concept of the “ethnos” itself, in *The Fourth Political Theory* he only touches upon it in passing, defining it as “a community of language, religious belief, daily life, and the sharing of resources and goals.” However, he develops it much more fully in a lecture series on “ethno-sociology” (a term that means the same as cultural or social anthropology, ethnology or structural anthropology), which can be viewed on YouTube. This lecture series clarifies what Dugin actually means by the term ethnos. It also presents categories of thought characteristic of non-Western, archaic societies, which are presented as part of Dugin’s project to find an alternative to the destructive and nihilistic “Western logos.”

The first part of Dugin’s course is a very summary overview of different national schools of social anthropology, which he sees as an important peripheral scientific discipline that has the potential to challenge and subvert Western cultural hegemony (i.e., Western “racism”). Those familiar with the work

of Kevin MacDonald and his book *The Culture of Critique* will be struck by Dugin's very positive evaluation of figures like the Jewish-American anthropologist Franz Boas, who is famous for having tried to debunk the concept of race.

Dugin is especially interested in the French school of structural anthropology, founded by the Jewish-French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, who was a student of the Jewish-Russian linguist Roman Jakobson. This connection is important to Dugin, since Jakobson was not only one of the founders of the structuralist school in linguistics, but also a Eurasianist. Structuralist anthropology is also an important link between the study of pre-modern forms of rationality and poststructuralist thought, and between "holistic" conservative thought and postmodern relativism. The structuralist method — viewing a culture as a system of synchronic relations — is assimilated by Dugin to the holistic, organic view of society characteristic of conservative thinkers. Dugin also says that his concept of "ethnos" based on the work of the Russian ethnologist Sergey Shirokogorov, who studied archaic tribes living on the Siberian tundra. Shirokogorov's work also functions as a link between the concept of "ethnos" and the political ideology of Eurasianism.

Dugin has proposed the "ethnos" and "civilization" as possible subjects of the "fourth political theory." For Dugin, the "ethnos," and not the individual, is the social "atom" (the simplest, most basic form of social being). The "ethnos," however, is only fully embodied by primitive hunter-gatherer societies and neolithic agrarian societies. Again, the ethnos is not a racial group. The essence of the "ethnos," as Dugin defines this term, is not a biological fact, but a social, symbolic, and linguistic structure. He is always careful to emphasize that the ethnos is a cultural phenomenon, not defined by blood relations or race. It is similar to the phenomenological concept of a pre-logical "life world" (*Lebenswelt*). The "life world" is a community's shared horizon of understanding. The notion of life world allows Dugin to link the concept of "ethnos" to Heidegger's concept of *Dasein* as being-in-the-world. This is important because *Dasein* is supposed to be the "subject" of the fourth political theory. The ethnos, then, is apparently a way in which *Dasein* exists.

Although the notion of ethnos is only fully applicable to archaic societies, it continues to exist as a residual stratum in modern societies, in the form of the timeless symbols and archetypes of the collective unconscious. In modern society, the ethnic life-world has disintegrated and society has increasingly devolved into an economic system governed by a purely instrumental, technological rationality. By taking the ethnos as a paradigm of interpretation, it is set up as the "normal" type of society, and modern society is viewed as a deviation from or distortion of this original standard. The methods of social anthropology, developed specifically for the study of primitive societies, can then be used as a critical tool in the interpretation of modern societies — something already attempted by postmodern figures like Jean Baudrillard. The non-individualist, non-utilitarian gift economies of

primitive societies, based on symbolic exchange, are even presented, albeit in exceedingly vague and general terms, as the possible basis of an alternative economic system.

The ethnos itself cannot be properly understood using historical methods. This is because archaic, primitive societies are ahistorical, or prehistorical. They lack written records. They live in mythical time rather than historical time — mythical time in Mircea Eliade's sense, the time of the eternal return of the same. The ethnos (primitive society) is not an historical community but a social structure that reproduces itself indefinitely. This means that it must be studied using the methods of structuralism, which were initially developed within the field of linguistics but later applied to the social sciences. Structuralists view primitive societies as systems of symbolic oppositions that must be studied holistically and synchronically, like a language. They cannot be adequately interpreted in causal terms, whether as the result of biological evolution (Dugin rejects evolutionary interpretations of culture as tainted by the "racist," modern doctrine of progress) or as arising from historical processes. The ethnos is simply a phenomenological given. Although it frequently seems to be a purely theoretical and artificial construct, Dugin insists that it is empirically validated by ethnological studies of archaic societies.

Instead of historical terms, the ethnos must be interpreted in spatial (synchronic) terms. The spatial structure of the ethnos, however, is first of all an expression of the specific landscape in which it dwells. The landscape should not be understood in simply material or naturalistic terms. The landscape of the ethnos is a sacred landscape. It is not just the natural environment of a tribal group, but the symbolic, mythical space into which the natural environment is inscribed. The concept of "nature," even in its anti-modern, romantic form, already presupposes man's separation and alienation from the cosmos as a primordial totality. The world of naive, primitive man, of the ethnos, is a whole prior to oppositions like artificial and natural, subject and object, symbolic and the real, language and things, thought and experience, the individual and society (and in this sense, it shares characteristics with the postmodern world, in which the boundaries between the virtual and the real, the natural and the technological are erased).

What Heidegger calls "a world" is a space of possibilities rather than a collection of objects observed from the outside. There is no independently existing, transcendental subject that subsequently crosses over into the world, no objective world that confronts a detached, abstract subject. Being-in-the-world comes first, and the subject and its "sense-data" are only abstracted out of it. The philosophical opposition of subject and object conceals the primordial unity of being-in-the-world, which is irreducible to the subject-object relation. Concrete being-in-the-world is studied phenomenologically, uncovering its temporal and spatial structure.

The fundamental polarity of the ethnos is not that between the subject and object, but between the sacred and the profane. The polarity between the sacred and the profane corresponds to the polarity between the exceptional and the normal. The profane is the normal, and the sacred is a crisis in the normal course of events — an exception that suspends the oppositions that structure social reality, transcending them and tracing their limits. The sacred is both dangerous and salvific (“Wo aber Gefahr ist, wächst/Das Rettende auch” — Hölderlin). The sacred marks the uncrossable limits of communal life — uncrossable insofar as the one who crosses them, ceases to be part of the community, or becomes other. The sacred is a paradigm common to nature and society, designating the primordial whole that transcends them and includes them. The sacred is the basis of norms in the sense that it is a limit that unites and gathers all the separate regions of the world, determining their “measures.” The dimension of the sacred presumably belongs to the structure of Being itself, so that it can never be entirely eliminated, even in the most secularized of modern societies — it can only be displaced and distorted.

The space of the ethnos is structured by the relation between a sacred center (pole) and a profane margin. Here, Dugin seems to draw on Mircea Eliade’s work on the symbolism of the center. According to Eliade, sacred space is founded, oriented, and ordered around a central point marked by a “hierophany”: a revelation of the sacred. The center is symbolically designated by the erection of an axis mundi, an axis that connects the various dimensions or regions of the cosmos. Space, then, is not homogenous, but differentiated by a central, vertical sacred axis or core and a profane, horizontal periphery or margin. Traditional cosmogonies frequently describe the cosmos as growing out of a central point. As Eliade defines it, the center is any point at which a vertical movement between different ontological planes or cosmic regions — between profane and sacred space, between heaven and earth, gods and mortals, the realm of the living and of the dead — can occur. It is the pole, the world-pillar, the sacred mountain — Yggdrasil, Olympus, Meru, Irminsul. Climbing a mountain, a cosmic tree or pillar is a passage from one plane to another. Yggdrasil connects the nine worlds to each other and makes it possible to travel between them. The sacred center is also the spinal column of the yogi, the Vedic sacrificial pole, the totem pole, a lingam, or a sacred tree. It is the gathering symbol of the Christian cross. It is the altar upon which the redemptive sacrificial death of Christ is re-enacted. Churches and temples are oriented around the centrality of the altar. A cornerstone or the central column of a building is another embodiment of the sacred center. The axis unites within itself the symbolism of transcendence and of foundation. It is the column that supports the “house of Being.” The center makes it possible for man to dwell in the world (the English word “home” is a cognate of the Old Norse word heimr, “world”), it is the pole that gathers, unifies, and orders a cosmos. According to Eliade, its “temporal” counterpart is the sun at its zenith — which for Nietzsche was a symbol of the revelation of the unity of Being and becoming in eternal cosmic recurrence.

While modern society revolves around the pole of the “sacred” and inviolable individual, each ethnos is gathered around a non-individual sacred axis. The ethnos views itself as dwelling near the sacred center of the world. It is the proximity to this point of origin, this source of power and pole of attraction that

roots the ethnos in a landscape. It is not primarily defined by borders — by the exclusion of an “other,” an enemy — but by the centripetal attraction of a pole of transcendence.

Each civilization, while encompassing several ethne, is also organized around a pole, which presumably forms one of the poles of multipolarity. Dugin says that the symbol of Eurasianism, eight arrows radiating out from a central point, is a symbol of the “ethno-center,” a sacred pole. The radiating arrows are not only a symbol of Russian ambitions of imperialist expansion. They also symbolize the origin of Tradition in the Eurasian heartland, and its subsequent diffusion throughout the rest of the world. Dugin claims that “excavations in Eastern Siberia and Mongolia prove that exactly here were the most ancient centers of civilization.” Finally, in an added postmodern touch, the symbol of Eurasianism is also a “chaosphere,” a symbol of chaos invented by the British science fiction and fantasy author Michael Moorcock in his 1970 novel *The Eternal Champion*. This is presumably an allusion to Dugin’s “chaotic logos,” and perhaps also to “right-wing anarchism” and its conception of the sovereign “anarch.”

Each ethnos is a “logos.” As Heidegger famously noted, the Greek word logos (speech) is related to the verb *legein*, an agrarian term signifying “gathering,” “harvesting” (the ethnos, remember, is a hunter-gatherer or archaic agrarian society). The logos gathers together everything that has been made distinct by being named, including the dead and the gods, into a single space or “place” (Ort). In this sense, language is the “house of Being.” It is an ordering of space and time, inscribing the landscape and the cycle of the seasons into itself by means of a calendar, a map and a taxonomy. Space, time, man, and nature are gathered together in a single, permanent, identical figure: a world. Dugin identifies this figure with the ethnos, which strives to conserve and reproduce itself as a world, but not as a biological entity (although he does not make it clear why biological conservation of the race is not a necessary part of the conservation of the ethnos as world). He also identifies the ethnos with a specific language.

Since each ethnos is a “logos” — in the sense of a structure of language, of thought, and of social relations — this becomes the basis for a kind of cultural and linguistic relativism. There is not just the one, universal Reason of the western Enlightenment. There are many different valid “rationalities” (although “reason,” “rationality,” and “logic” are already deviations from the original meaning of “logos”). The fourth political theory rejects the “epistemological hegemony” of the West. The Western conceptions of Reason, enlightenment, and “emancipation” are not the universal goal that “humanity” is consciously or unconsciously striving towards, with ethnic and cultural differences viewed as mere particularistic obstacles to be overcome on the way. The dominance of the Western form of rationality tends to exclude all other forms of rationality and deny their legitimacy. Dugin, like other postmodernists, wants to relativize the Western logos as only one of many possible logoi, without any legitimate claim to a privileged status. The relationship between these logoi is non-hierarchical, anarchic, and pluralistic. Insofar as a subject is a kind of rationality, there are many different types of subjects — not just the modern, Western, enlightened version of humanity, defined by Western

rationality. In other words, Dugin reiterates the postmodern critiques of Western culture, all of which are familiar ad nauseam to anyone who has attended a Western university. The global political hegemony of the West is founded on the hegemony of Western reason. Western rationality (technological rationality) not only allowed western man to subjugate his natural environment, it allowed the West to subjugate the rest of the world. It forced other peoples to choose between adopting the Western model themselves, or remaining colonial subjects of the West.

According to the ideology of the Enlightenment, reason is universal, and is the defining characteristic of universal human nature, of man as animal rationale. Reason is what all human beings have in common, a common norm on the basis of which conflicts can be neutralized and mediated, and the world ultimately harmonized. This is the telos – the goal and end-point – of history, and the path towards it is progressive, universal enlightenment, gradually overcoming the dark demons and specters of myth and irrationality, and in the process, uniting humanity. When this goal and ideal end-point is reached, conflict, and hence politics in any real sense, will cease to exist.

The focus of a multi-polar world-view is not on universal reason, but on the specific world of each ethnos, which is prior to the separation between reason and intuition, logos and myth. Each ethnos identifies itself with the world (the cosmos), or at least sees itself as the center of the world, insofar as it believes itself to be dwelling in the proximity of the “sacred center.” The ethnos is a society rooted in a mythical space-time, a sacred geography.

Outside of the cosmos of the ethnos, there is only an elemental chaos, an abyss, the residue of creation. Chaos cannot be eliminated, only held at bay and circumscribed by a boundary. Chaos cannot manifest itself directly. It can only show itself by taking on a paradoxical figure of form: by masking itself as a “nothingness that is.” It seizes or takes possession of an individual, who then becomes its vessel and personification (as in the case of shamanic possession, or the totemic figure representing the tribe’s founder). There, the nameless forces of the “outside” are socialized and can address the community, taking on the personae (the “masks”) of demons, spirits, or gods. Through this personification, the sacred becomes a “subject” that can engage in symbolic exchange with the community. The shaman or healer is the central figure of tribal or “ethnic” society, who communicates and mediates between the ethnos and the beyond — the sacred realm of the dead, demons, or gods. The shaman is both a liminal and a “conservative” figure, a guardian who works to conserve the cosmic order, waging war on demons and malignant spirits of the chaotic outside. His or her work consists in dealing with the various crises that the ethnos and its members periodically go through. The shaman not only heals individuals in the tribe, but above all heals the tribe itself and the cosmos, making them whole, restoring the cosmic order founded on sacred boundaries. He or she does so by passing from one ontological plane to another by climbing the axis mundi, the sacred pillar, mountain or world-tree.

Eliade believed that shamanism originated in Eurasia. Eliade also views the shaman as a kind of proto-sovereign, in the sense that he is able to magically bind and unbind. He occupies a “liminal” position — managing crises within the normal order of the tribe and cosmos, but doing so only insofar as he communicates with the dangerous, chaotic outside. He possesses traits similar to those that according to Carl Schmitt define sovereignty — the power to suspend or transgress the normative order, not in order to destroy it, but in order to re-affirm it, to preserve it from dissolution and chaos.

The shaman enacts the primordial, permanent struggle or strife, the activity and dynamism that underlies the static structure of the ethnos. The dynamic of the ethnos, however, is opposed to the new. It views all change as a crisis, as entropy, eroding the stability of the cosmos. The ethnos is inherently conservative and anti-historical, in the sense that the sole purpose of its activity is to maintain homeostasis. It works to maintain its identity with itself. Its main concern is self-reproduction (again, this is not in the sense of the biological preservation and self-reproduction of the race). In reproducing itself, the ethnos ritually restores and maintains the order and equilibrium of the cosmos and the flow of its circular economy. Its existence is centered in the cycle of the seasons, of seeding and harvesting, child-birth and death. The time of the ethnos, then, is not linear and irreversible (historical), but recurrent, circular, and reversible. Using Armin Mohler’s terminology, we could also call the unbroken, holistic time-space of the ethnos a “sphere” (“Kugel”). It is a whole that has not yet been split into the dualisms of time and eternity, matter and spirit, man and nature, individual and society, etc.

Since the time of the ethnos is the eternal return of the same, death itself is not an irreversible event. The souls of the ancestors return in their descendants. The individual as a historically unique, mortal being does not exist. Children are assimilated into the tribe through initiation. When they are initiated into adulthood, they become reincarnations of their ancestors. The “person” exists only as a kind of mask, a personification of the dead. Individuality has no positive meaning for the ethnos. In this sense, the ethnos is the reverse of modern society, in which the individual is encouraged to define itself in opposition to the community. Instead of the individual, it is the ethnos as a whole that is the normative unit, “the man.” In other words, it could be viewed as a kind of “subject.”

At this point, however, it becomes unclear what this can have to do with Dasein, since Dasein is defined precisely by its historicity, finitude, and mortality. For Heidegger, men are, in their deepest and most fundamental essence, mortals. Dasein’s mortality is primordial, not the consequence of modern Western man’s loss of faith, materialism or nihilism. In a sense, the essence of man — Dasein — is finitude, and for Heidegger it is crucial that finitude is not simply a human characteristic, but part of the essence of Being itself. Dasein, as finitude, belongs to the structure of Being itself, so that the question of Dasein is a necessary step in approaching the question of Being. Heidegger elaborates his concept of

Dasein not as a philosophical anthropology, but as a part of his ontological project. Dugin talks about Dasein, but relativizes the term, reducing it to an anthropological concept and detaching it from the question of Being. In doing this, Dugin effectively empties the term of meaning.

As a consequence, Dugin fails to understand that for Heidegger, the essence of nihilism as the forgetting of Being is also not simply a human error — and much less the error only of Western humanity — but the self-concealing essence of Being itself. The essence of nihilism is not something “created” by human beings at all. Moreover, only the fully realized nihilism that coincides with the end of Western metaphysics and the planetary dominion of modern technology opens up the possibility of a more authentic formulation of the question of Being. Contrary to what Traditionalists believe, nihilism cannot be overcome through a return to metaphysics, since nihilism is itself the final actualization of metaphysics. The essence of metaphysics is the movement of transcendence (Übersteigen) of beings by Being. All metaphysical concepts are structured by the fundamental ontological difference between Being and beings, i.e., the transcendence of beings by Being, through which beings are gathered, grounded, and held in suspense by the withdrawal of Being.

Heidegger made it clear that he did not believe that nihilism could be overcome simply through a recourse to Eastern traditions. He wrote: “I am convinced that a change can only be prepared from the same place in the world where the modern technological world originated. It cannot come about by the adoption of . . . Eastern experiences of the world. The help of the European tradition and a new appropriation of that tradition are needed for a change in thinking. Thinking will only be transformed by a thinking that has the same origin and destiny.” In this sense, Heidegger’s position is considerably more sophisticated than Dugin’s. Dugin instead believes that all we need do to step out of Western, masculine “logocentrism” and nihilism is to “explore other cultures, rather than Western, to try to find different examples of inclusive philosophy, inclusive religions, and so on.”

The historicity (Geschichtlichkeit) of Dasein is founded on the irreversible and unrepeatable event (Geschehnis) that Dasein itself is. Dasein is not only mortal, but also “natal” (gebürtig). Natality is the essence of historicity (Geschichtlichkeit). Birth is an “event” (Geschehnis) in the sense that ontologically, it is an absolute beginning (even though biologically, it is of course a natural event, part of a nexus of causes and effects). Man has a history because man — as Dasein — is himself history, because he is himself an event. Authentic existence is in itself history, in the sense of a crisis, a decision, a discontinuity, a break in time.

Death, for Heidegger, is not simply a natural occurrence, a consequence of the fact that our bodies are part of the natural world and conditioned by its cycles of growth and entropy. On the contrary, man’s

mortality separates him (as Dasein) from the natural realm. It has the power to tear Dasein out of the automatisms of inauthentic social relations, the commerce of everyday life and the impostures of false subjectivity. Heidegger calls this sleep-walking, inauthentic existence “das Man.” Das Man is not responsible for its existence. Instead, it observes existence from the outside, as a kind of spectacle. Das Man never feels “addressed” by death, which always concerns “someone else.” In a sense, “the subject” — abstract humanity — is das Man — a free-floating ego detached from concrete, historical, finite existence. Being-towards-death, on the other hand, isolates Dasein, liberates it and awakens it from inauthentic existence. Being-towards-death is freedom in the sense that Dasein’s relation to nothingness is a transcendence, a movement going beyond the totality of everything that exists and can exist. Dasein is free in a fundamentally different way from the “subject” of idealist philosophy, a subject that is free because it is unconditioned. Finitude is for Heidegger not just a contingent, naturally given limit to freedom, power, and life. Heidegger’s finitude is ontological, not natural. In this sense, his thinking differs fundamentally from that of traditionalism, which views mortality as characterising only man’s lower, physical and natural existence. The mortality of Dasein is not “natural.” It is entirely different from the mortality of an animal. Dasein’s finitude, being-towards-death, is a freedom and a “transcendence” in the sense “going beyond.” But Dasein’s “transcendence” is not the transcendence of a subject suspended above concrete existence, or of an immortal being.

The limit that isolates, opens, and liberates Dasein is not simply negative or privative, but positive and active — active in the sense of a power, a movement of transcendence that is also a decision and a break in time. The limit points beyond itself, to that which transcends, overpowers, or “overcomes.” That is why the individuality of authentic Dasein should not be misunderstood as the arbitrary freedom of existentialism, or the hedonistic egoism of liberal individualism. The finitude of Dasein is given meaning only as a problem, a question, a responsibility. Only as responsibility is human existence meaningful, only as responsibility does transcend itself. The authentic freedom of Dasein is also not an unconditioned freedom from time and history, but is historicity (*Geschichtlichkeit*) itself as an event (*Geschehnis*).

Heidegger would view the historicity of primitive, tribal Dasein as only existing as something undeveloped or pre-conscious. Only Western man has a deeper experience of the fundamentally historical essence of Dasein as an event (*Geschehnis*), which corresponds to Being as an event (*Ereignis*). However, this experience has remained unthought and philosophically unelaborated, because thinking has remained trapped by the categories of metaphysics, subjectivism, and Christian humanism. Dugin, however, attempts to relativize Heidegger’s notion of Dasein, claiming that it only applies to Western Europeans. In doing so, however, Dugin shows himself to be more a postmodern relativist than a Heideggerian. By giving complete ontological priority to language, he renders the concept of Dasein effectively meaningless. For Heidegger, man does not exist as Dasein because he has a language, but has a language because he exists as Dasein. In other words, man does not have a relation to Being because he has a language, but has a language because man’s essence is Dasein, and Dasein is a relation to (or

responsibility for) Being. Dasein is ontologically prior to language and social life. The existential structure of Dasein cannot itself be determined by the structure of language and society. Heidegger's position is in a sense absolutely opposed to that of relativism, which makes reality — including man himself — entirely a creation of man. It goes without saying that it is also opposed to communism, which interprets humanity's emancipation as man's self-production.

Since the ethnos, according to Dugin, does not know irreversible, historical time — only cyclical time, the eternal return of the same — it is inherently opposed not only to everything new, but to all forms of accumulation. The ethnos ritually destroys (sacrifices) accumulated resources that could endanger its homeostasis and symbolic equilibrium. Not only a deficit, but an excess of production is viewed as dangerous and problematic. In this sense, its economy is anti-capitalist. It constantly interrupts the linear time of accumulation. Accumulation is viewed as a kind of "guilt," as a debt to the gods that must be re-paid. To sacrifice something — to destroy an accumulated excess — means to give it to the gods. The ethnos strives to conserve a social and cosmic equilibrium, as well as an equilibrium between society and nature. Society is naturalized and nature is socialized. Together, they form a sacred whole, a circular economy or "circuit."

The ethnos, then, is a form of primordial, pre-historic communism in which work is play, and man lives in perfect accord with his natural environment. It is an ecologically sound, harmonious cosmic and social totality, a golden age before man's fall into history, a paradise in which the entropic, destructive force of time is defeated, or at least held in check. The ethnos does not know the social tension of hierarchy and stratification, and there is no division of labor, except between the genders. The relationship between the genders, however, is also balanced and non-patriarchal. The space-time of the ethnos, as we noted earlier, is reversible, and this goes for its social relations, too. There are no asymmetrical, hierarchical relationships, only a balance maintained through symbolic exchange. In other words, the ethnos is a democratic and egalitarian society (at least on a symbolic level). As an embodiment of the golden age, it represents the primordial perfection of man. The man of the ethnos, in other words, is a sort of noble savage (a modern concept if there ever was one!) that can be opposed to the decadence of Western society since the scientific revolution.

The restoration of this primordial unity, bringing linear history and capitalist accumulation to an end in a revolutionary holocaust, is according to Dugin the unconscious mythical and eschatological dimension of communism. The revolution abolishes linear time, which is identified with entropy, accumulation, and usury. Dugin apparently thinks that the violence of communist revolutions should be interpreted as a kind of sacrificial destruction of accumulated wealth. Capitalist accumulation is an excess that must be sacrificially destroyed through the liquidation of the bourgeoisie as a class.

The modern age is the age of revolutions, but as Jünger observed, the violence of revolutions — including the Terror of the French revolution — could be interpreted as a return of repressed elemental forces under the mask of enlightened modernity. Just as gods, spirits, and demons communicate with the tribe by personifying themselves in the shaman, elemental chaos shows itself under the mask, the “persona” of the modern, supposedly rational, revolutionary subject. This is why for Dugin, the only real problem with communism was that it failed to understand itself. Its self-interpretation, its “hermeneutic circle” must be shattered. Communism made a mistake regarding the political subject. It saw class, rather than the archaic ethnos, as its subject. It wore the mask of a modern, progressive, secular ideology. This is why Marxists could not understand why communist revolutions took place in undeveloped, agrarian societies, and not, as Marx had predicted, in industrially developed societies like Germany.

Authentic communism, Dugin argues, is “national communism” (represented by Stalin, for example) or agrarian communism (represented by Pol Pot). “National communism” (or “national gauchism,” as Dugin also calls it) is interpreted as a revolt against the Western, modern world, a revolt rooted in local, ethnic traditions. National communism is a hybrid of the Western rationality of Marxism and the mobilizing force of non-Western ethnic myths. Dugin points to the “National Communist character of successful Marxist revolutions, recognizing nationalistic elements as a driving factor and virtue, providing these revolutions with success and stability via archaic national stories of the mobilization of Marxism as nationally interpreted eschatological myth” (The Fourth Political Theory, p. 128). “National Communism,” Dugin tells us, “ruled in the USSR, Communist China, North Korea, Vietnam, Albania, Cambodia, and also in many Communist movements of the Third World, from the Mexican Chiapas and Peruvian Sendero Luminoso to the Kurdish Workers’ Party and Islamic socialism (p. 128). In national communism/gauchism, Marxism functions as a universal philosophical framework that allows national movements — local by their nature — to communicate with each other and “even claim universality and planetary breadth; transforming, thanks to socialist rationality warmed up by nationalism, into a messianic project” (p. 130). In his opinion, “National Gauchism could certainly have a global future, insofar as among many segments of humanity archaic, ethnic and religious energies are far from being spent, whatever can be said of the citizens of the modern, enlightened and rational West” (p. 131). In reality, mass non-white immigration to the West, attracted by its earthly “paradise” or “golden age” of material wealth, religious tolerance, modernity, and generous welfare systems, has long since made it obvious that non-white peoples are not the subjects of a revolt against the global domination of subversive forces, but simply one of the instruments of a globalist, collectivist, and ethnocidal anthropological revolution.

Dugin appears to equate the white West with the bourgeoisie, and non-white peoples (or Russians insofar as they are “not fully white”) with the revolutionary subject. He believes that the first successful communist revolution took place in Russia because the “ethnos” had retained more of its primitive vitality there than in the modern West (remember, Dugin views Russians as non-white, a mixture of

Slavic, Turkic, and Mongol blood). His concept of the ethnos allows him to interpret Russia's backwardness as a positive trait, rather than as a source of shame. It becomes obvious that Dugin's Russian chauvinism is an overcompensation for what is really a collective inferiority complex. Russia's backwardness is interpreted as the proof that it has successfully warded off infection by the "evils" of Western modernity. The communist revolution was in its essence a revolt of the Eurasian Russian ethnos against Western-oriented elites. Bolshevism was a re-Asianisation of Russia. Rather than taking the modern West as a norm, which can only lead to devaluing the history of Russia and other non-Western nations as marginal and backward, Dugin wants to reverse the relationship, restoring Eurasia to the dignity of the "sacred center" and marginalizing the West as its "profane periphery."

Dugin assigns a central, messianic role to Russia analogous to the messianic role the German conservative revolutionaries assigned to Germany as the sacred center or axis of Europe. Eurasia is not only a locus of the great geopolitical decisions of our time, it is a sacred center also in the sense of a crossing, a crucial point, an intersection and mediator between East and West, Europe and Asia. A similar role is assigned to Iran, Hungary, and Turkey as Eurasian mediators between the East and Europe. Eurasianists declare themselves to be close to the leftist Turkish Workers' Party, and Turkey is viewed by Eurasianists as part of Europe for purely geopolitical reasons.

One of Dugin's Italian associates, Claudio Mutti, himself a convert to Islam, argues that the massive occupation of German territory by Turkish immigrants will be a positive factor in favoring the integration of Turkey and Germany into a common Eurasian empire. This may be connected with the idea that the Russians are a blend of Slavic and Turkic blood. Or it may be that here, as seems to be the rule for Eurasianists, geographical and geopolitical considerations take complete precedence over racial factors, to the point of completely denying the latter.

We see the implications of Dugin's conception of the ethnos as constituted not by race or by history, but by a space. Here, for some reason, Dugin is suddenly no longer a social constructivist. Geopolitical determinism is substituted for racial or historical materialist determinism. Geopolitical factors are seen as being more decisive than both racial and economic factors. Racial nationalism is rejected as either "utopian" or "reactionary." The issue of race is not viewed as being of critical, decisive importance — what is decisive for the Eurasianists — what determines the distinction between friend and enemy — is the fight against the West.

This complete precedence given to soil at the expense of blood makes the relevance of Eurasianism for European nationalists today — for whom immigration is the existentially decisive question — very dubious. The massive occupation of European soil by African and Middle Eastern immigrants does not

make them Europeans and never will. This is not just because they lack a deep relationship to European soil and traditions, but also because they are racially alien. Blacks and Arabs in Europe may be “westernized,” but that only means globalized, that is, Americanized. Homo americanus is the normative “human” type of the postmodern age. Evola’s discussion of America at the end of *Revolt Against the Modern World* remains valid: American individualism, deprived of any transcendent reference point, fatally leads to a collectivism and racial promiscuity that are a spontaneous equivalent to Soviet collectivism.

Dugin tries to interpret Marxism’s profane, linear vision of history in terms of cyclical, mythic time, making the communist political revolution into a cyclical cosmic revolution, a return to a utopian golden age. Just as he tries to translate historical time into mythical time, he tries to translate geopolitical space into sacred geography. In the Manichean and tiresomely propagandistic narrative of the Eurasianists, the East is paradise (Eden) and the West is hell.

Sacred geography on the basis of ‘space symbolism’ traditionally considers the East as ‘the land of Spirit’, the paradise land, the land of a completeness, abundance, the Sacred ‘native land’ in its fullest and most perfect kind. . . . The West has the opposite symbolical meaning. It is the ‘country of death’, the ‘lifeless world’ West is ‘the empire of exile’, ‘the pit of the rejected’, according to the expression of Islamic mystics. West is “anti-east,” the country of . . . decay, degradation, transition from the manifest to the non-manifest, from life to death, from completeness to need, etc.

Moreover, the West is a pole of attraction magnetically drawing towards itself decadent elements.

Along the East-West axis were drawn peoples and civilizations, possessing hierarchical characters — closer to the East were those closer to Sacred, to Tradition, to spiritual wealth. Closer to West, those of a more decayed, degraded and dying Spirit. . . .

[S]acred geography univocally affirms the law of ‘qualitative space’, in which the East represents the symbolic ‘ontological plus’, and the West the ‘ontological minus’. According to the Chinese tradition, the East is Yang, the male, bright, solar principle, and the West is Yin, the female, dark, lunar principle.” “Geopolitical East represents in itself the straight opposition to geopolitical West. . . . Instead of ‘democracy’ and ‘human right’ the East gravitates around totalitarianism, socialism and authoritarianism, i.e. around various types of social regimes, whose only common feature is that the center of their systems there is not the ‘individual’, ‘man’ with his ‘rights’ and his peculiar ‘individual values’, but something supra-individual, supra-human — be it ‘society’, ‘nation’, ‘people’, ‘idea’,

‘weltanschauung’, ‘religion’, ‘cult of the leader’ etc. The East opposed to western liberal democracy the most various types of non-liberal, non-individualistic societies — from authoritarian monarchy up to theocracy or socialism. Moreover, from a pure typological, geopolitical point of view, the political specificity of this or that regime was secondary in comparison with the qualitative dividing between ‘western’ (= ‘individualist — mercantile’) order and ‘eastern’ (= ‘supra-individualist — based on force’) order. Representative forms of such anti-western civilization were the USSR, communist China, Japan about 1945 or Khomeini’s Iran. (“From Sacred Geography to Geopolitics”)

Here, Dugin deviates completely from traditionalism in confusing brute force with supra-individual authority, in what amounts to the inversion of the traditional doctrine of authority in a kind of worship of material force (‘might makes right’). He also deviates completely from traditionalism in interpreting communist forms of totalitarianism and collectivism, as well as the unstratified, non-hierarchical collectivism of primitive societies, as “supra-individual” and transcendent. Evola, who never advocated totalitarianism (which he regarded as a terminal phenomenon), viewed both totalitarianism and collectivism as the opposite of supra-individual and transcendent — as sub-personal and undifferentiated (see *Revolt Against the Modern World*, chapter 37).

Ernst Jünger, in his National Bolshevik/national revolutionary period, believed that not only bourgeois individualism, but also the flip side of the same coin, the formless collectivism of the masses would be overcome by the emergence of a new “type” of man, which he called “the Worker,” who would be capable of mastering the forces mobilized by modern technology. But Dugin simply adopts, reversing it, Popper’s liberal reduction of fascism and communism to the single term “totalitarianism,” reducing radically heterogeneous movements to the same, simply because they reject liberalism. In this sense, he actually interprets fascism not so much from the point of view of the left, as from the point of view of liberalism.

From a traditionalist point of view, moreover, nationalism, fascism and national socialism are negative phenomena insofar as long as they are collectivist, that is, insofar as the elemental forces of race remain on a purely material and human level, and are not purified through their integration with a spiritual dimension. Analogously, the traditionalist rejection of bourgeois individualism is not a rejection of the value of the individual as such, but only of its detachment from a transcendent reference point and its reduction to a purely human and material plane.

The ethnos, then, is not what traditionalists like Evola call a solar traditional society. Moreover, given that the ethnos is in its essence ahistorical and lacks a relation to the other, Dugin has not sufficiently clarified how it can be a political and historical subject. It is also unclear how Dugin proposes to unite

Heidegger's concept of Dasein as historicity with the anti-historical position of traditionalism. He has, however, proposed another possible political and historical subject: civilization.

DUGIN ON HERMAN WIRTH & HYPERBOREA

Herman Wirth's Theory of Civilization

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 22 of Part 2, "Theories of Civilizations: Criteria, Concepts, and Correspondences", of Noomakhia: Geosophy – Horizons and Civilizations (Moscow, Akademicheskii Proekt, 2017).

The Cultural Circle of Thule

Bachofen's idea of primordial matriarchy and his theory of "cultural circles" were developed by another historian, archaeologist, and specialist in paleo-epigraphy, Herman Wirth (1885-1981).

Wirth's theories are based on the hypothesis borrowed from the Indian author Bala Gandhara Tilak (1856-1920) [1], that the original Proto-Indo-European civilization was formed in the late Paleolithic (the Aurignacian culture) in the lands of the Northern polar circle. This hypothesis was based on the interpretation of the data of Indian astrology, Vedic texts, and the myths of the Hindus, Iranians, and Greeks which speak of the existence in remote antiquity of a populated country lying in the Far North (Hyperborea). This continent was described in the Vedas as the "land of the white boar", Varahi, and the "island of light", or Sweta Dvipa. The Zoroastrian tradition speaks of the ancient abode of the first man, the city of Vara, located in the Far North, from which he was forced to descend southwards as the dark deity Angra Mainyu, the enemy of the god of light, Ahura-Mazda, unleashed a "great cold" across these lands. Tilak argues for the existence of this "Nordic" proto-civilization on the basis of Indian astrology, the symbolism of which, according to Tilak, becomes clear only if we accept that the constellations were originally observed in the circumpolar regions, where the day of the gods is equal to the year of men.

Wirth adopted this hypothesis and constructed his own theory upon it, the "Hyperborean theory" [2] or theory of the "cultural circle of Thule" [3], which represents the Greek name for the mythical city lying in the country of the Hyperboreans. According to this theory, before the latest wave of global cooling, the circumpolar zone in the North Atlantic Ocean was home to inhabitable lands whose inhabitants were the creators of a primordial cultural code. This culture was formed under conditions when the natural environment of the Arctic was not yet so harsh, and when its climate was similar to the modern temperate Central European climate. There were present all the annual and atmospheric phenomena

which can be observed in the Arctic today: the Arctic day and Arctic night. The yearly solar and lunar cycles of the Arctic are structured differently than their counterparts in middle-range latitudes. Thus, the symbolic fixations of the calendar, the trajectory of the sun, the moon, and the constellations of the zodiac necessarily had a different form and different patterns.

On the basis of an enormous swathe of archaeological, paleo-epigraphical (cave paintings, Paleolithic symbols, ancient carvings, etc.), mythological, and philological material, Herman Wirth undertook an attempt to reconstruct the primordial system of this Arctic proto-civilization's cultural code. At its heart he put the reconstructed proto-calendar, the last traces of which Wirth believed are constituted by the Scandinavian runes, which he attributed to remote antiquity. Wirth proposed to examine this calendar, which records the key moments of the Arctic year, as the key to all later versions of mythological, religious, ritualistic, artistic, and philosophical heritages which continued and developed this primordial algorithm over the course of the wave-like migrations of the bearers of "Thulean culture" into the southern regions. When applied to other climatic conditions, however, many of the symbolic patterns of this calendar, otherwise crystal clear in the Arctic, lost their meaning and rationale. They were partially transferred to new realities, partially frozen as relics, and partially lost their meanings or acquired new ones.

First and foremost, this change entailed a fundamentally new understanding of the basic unit of time: instead of the Hyperborean day, equal to a year, the daily circle, which is much more clearly defined in the regions south of the polar circle, became the measure of events of human life. What is more, the localizing points of the spring and autumn equinoxes changed in relation to southward movement. All of this gradually confused the crystal clarity and simplicity of the primordial matrix.

Wirth believed that his reconstruction of the sacred complex of the culture of Thule lay at the heart of all historical types of writing and language, as well as musical tones, the symbolism of colors, ritual gestures, burials, religious complexes, etc.

Studying this culture formed the basis of Wirth's attempts at reconstructing what he called the "proto-writing" or "proto-script" of humanity. Wirth published the results of his studies in two monumental works, *Der Aufgang der Menschheit* (The Emergence of Mankind) [4] and *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit* (The Sacred Proto-Script of Mankind) [5], both equipped with an enormous lot of synoptic tables, comparative illustrations of archaeological excavations, writing systems, etc.

Nordic matriarchy

Wirth embraced Bachofen's notion of primordial matriarchy and attributed to the "Thule culture" a matriarchal form of civilization. He suggested that the belief that the female gender is inclined towards materiality, corporeality, chthonicity, and empirical specifics is purely a product of patriarchal censorship, and that matriarchy could be no less, indeed even more of a spiritual phenomenon than patriarchy. Wirth believed that societies dominated by women and female priesthods, religions, and cults represented the more advanced types of Hyperborean culture, which he termed the "culture of White Ladies" (weisse Frauen).

Wirth thus presented an altogether peculiar view on the relationship between matriarchy and patriarchy in the archaic culture of the Mediterranean region. In his point of view, the most ancient forms of culture in the Mediterranean were those established by bearers of the Hyperborean matriarchy, who in several stages descended from the circumpolar regions, from the North Atlantic, by sea (and that ships with shamrocks on the stern were characteristic of them). These were the people mentioned in ancient Near Eastern artifacts as the "sea-peoples", or am-uru, hence the ethnic name of the Amorites. The name Mo-uru, according to Wirth, once belonged to the very main center of the Hyperboreans, but was transmitted along with the natives of the North in their migration waves to new sacred centers. It is to these waves that we owe the Sumerian, Akkadian, Egyptian (whose pre-dynastic writing was linear), Hittite-Hurrian, Minoan, Mycenaean, and Pelasgian cultures. All of these Hyperborean strata were structured around the figure of the White Priestess.

Patriarchy, according to Wirth, was brought by immigrants from Asia, from the steppe zones of Turan, who distorted the primordial Hyperborean tradition and imposed upon the Mediterranean cultures quite different – rude, violent, aggressive, and utilitarian -values which contrasted (for worse) the pure spiritual forms of the Nordic matriarchy.

Thus, in Wirth we have the following reconstruction: the Hyperborean cultural circle's primordial, spiritual and highly-developed type of matriarchal culture spread from a circumpolar center, mainly by sea, penetrating the Mediterranean, scraping Africa, and even reaching the southern coast of Asia all the way down to Polynesia, where the Maori culture still retains traces of the ancient Arctic tradition. Another offshoot of the center of Mo-uru in the North Atlantic migrated to North America, where it laid the foundations of the cultural code of many tribes. One of Wirth's undertakings was to demonstrate a homology between these two branches that dispersed out of the culture of Thule – the European, Mediterranean, and further African and Pacific on the one hand, and the North-American on the other.[6]

Meanwhile, in continental Asia there formed a cultural pole which represented the embryo of proto-patriarchy. Wirth associated this culture with crude naturalism, phallic cults, and a martial, aggressive, and utilitarian type of culture, which Wirth believed to be lower and Asian. We have devoted a whole separate volume to a more detailed outline of Herman Wirth's views.[7]

The significance of Wirth's ideas to geosophy

Many aspects of Herman Wirth's unjustly forgotten works deserve attention in the study of plural anthropology. First of all, his extremely fertile hypothesis of the cultural circle of Thule, which is usually discarded from the outset without any careful analysis of his argumentation, is so rich that it deserves serious attention in itself. If such an hypothesis allows for the resolution of such numerous historical and archaeological problems associated with the history of symbols, signs, myths, rituals, hieroglyphs, the calendar, writing, and the most ancient views of the structure of space and time, then this alone is enough to warrant thorough inquiry. Even though Wirth's works contain many claims which seem either unequivocally wrong or highly controversial, we can set them aside and try to understand the essence of his theory which, in our opinion, is an extraordinarily constructive version that expands our understanding of the archaic epochs of the ancient history of mankind. The theory of the cultural circle of Thule need not be unconditionally accepted, but an assessment of its interpretive potential is necessary.

Secondly, Wirth's positive appraisal of matriarchy is extremely interesting and adds weight to sympathy for Bachofen. Indeed, we are dealing with an interpretation of a conditionally reconstructed matriarchal civilization from the position of what is the, in the very least nominal, patriarchy to which our society has become accustomed. Wirth proposes an alternative interpretation of the female Logos, an attempt to view the Logos of the Great Mother through different eyes. This is also an extremely unconventional and fertile proposal.

Thirdly, in Wirth's theories we can see clear analogues to the reconstructions of both Spengler and Frobenius. If Frobenius and especially Spengler took the side of Indo-European (Turanian, Eurasian) culture, i.e., the side of patriarchy as they interpreted it, then Wirth proposes to look at things from the standpoint of the civilization of the White Ladies, i.e., from the position of the primordial Mediterranean culture that preceded the invasion of the "people on war chariots."

Footnotes:

[1] Tilak, B.G., *Arkticheskaiia rodina v Vedakh* (Moscow: FAIR-PRESS, 2001). In English: Tilak, B.G., *The Arctic Home in the Vedas: Being Also a New Key to the Interpretation of Many Vedic Texts and Legends* (Poona City: Tilak Bros, 1903).

[2] Dugin, A.G., *Znaki Velikogo Norda: Giperboreiskaiia Teoriia* (Moscow: Veche, 2008). English translation of introduction available [here](#).

[3] Wirth, H., *Khronika Ura-Linda. Drevneishaiia istoriia Evropy* (Moscow: Veche, 2007). In German: Wirth, Herman. *Die Ura-Linda Chronik* (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1933).

[4] Wirth, H., *Der Aufgang der Menschheit. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Religion, Symbolik und Schrift der atlantisch-nordischen Rasse* (Jena: Diederichs, 1928).

[5] Wirth, H., *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit. Symbolgeschichtliche Untersuchungen diesseits und jenseits des Nordatlantik* (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1936).

[6] The full title of Wirth's *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit* specifies "on both sides of the North Atlantic." See footnote 5.

[7] See footnote 2.

Herman Wirth and the Sacred Proto-Language of Humanity: In Search of the Holy Grail of Meanings – Part 1

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

From "Lecture 4" in *Filosofiia traditsionalizma* (Moscow, ArktoGaia, 2002), originally delivered as a lecture at New University in 1998.

The existence of a single proto-language derives from the very logic of Tradition – attempts at reconstruction

The existence of a single proto-language of humanity derives from the very logic of Traditionalism. If there is a single Primordial Tradition, then the language of this Tradition must have a particular expression. This is obvious to any conscientious reader of Guénon and his followers. In addition, intuition suggests that the languages which modern humanity speaks harbor some strange commonality. When we engage in strict linguistic analysis, this commonality continues to elude us, but some kind of inner conviction does not allow us to cease searching.

Attempts at reconstructing this most ancient language have been constantly undertaken. There are many models of a proto-language which try to reduce existing linguistic and symbolic systems. There is the theory (developed in the Middle Ages) that Ancient Hebrew was the primordial language, and Kabbalistic schools existed which seriously attempted to deduce all other languages (including sacred and non-sacred ones, i.e., historical languages) out of Ancient Hebrew. We also have the “Egyptian theory” put forth in the 20th century by Schwaller de Lubicz and Les Veilleurs. Similar theses had been expressed before by numerous European mystics, such as Heinrich Khunrath, “Egyptian masonry”, etc. All of them tried to restore the proto-language and proto-symbolism on the basis of the Egyptian tradition. There is the famous book by the abbot Johannes Trithemius, *Steganographia*, which compiled mystical signs as symbols of an angelic language. Trithemius’ disciple, Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim, produced a whole series of angelic alphabets in his works. Also available are the reconstructions of circular “Atlantic” signs by Paul Le Cour, who published the journal *Atlantis*. There are also Guido von List’s runic tables which were also claimed to offer an interpretation of all languages through the Ancient Germanic and modern German languages. Baron von Sebottendorf explored the magic of the Arabic language and wrote an interesting pamphlet on the rituals of old Turkish masonry. The idea that all languages descend from Ancient Hebrew was also promoted by Fabre d’Olivet. There are also the only recently published commentaries by young Guénon on Saint Yves d’Alveydre’s *Archeometry*. The latter was an attempt at creating a universal alphabet that could explain the origin of all languages, traditions, and religious models. Saint Yves d’Alveydre spoke of the existence of a first, primordial language of Vattan in the underground country of Agharta.

There also exists the Brahmanic art of Nirukta (a theologized form of folk etymology), and the cabale phonétique was appealed to by Fulcanelli and the mysterious Grace d'Orsay, one of those astonishing authors who necessitates a separate, detailed discussion.

From the point of view of Tradition, everything necessarily converges to a single formula, a single model. If the world ends (and the end of the world, from the standpoint of Traditionalism, arises out of the infiniteness of its Principle), then finite knowledge about this world should exist. This means that it is possible to know everything all together at once (or almost at once) and forever, to know to the point that nothing in manifested reality is left out of sight. In some sense, absolute knowledge is therefore knowledge of absolute language. The search for such a single, absolute model was particularly actively pursued in the Middle Ages when the holistic approach to reality was widespread among mystics despite the creationist dogmas of official religion. People all at once engaged in mineralogy, theology, medicine, treated peoples and animals, and wrote treatises full of practical advice on smallpox, the names of angels, and the structure of grindstones. All of this comprised a search for integral knowledge, a single formula, a unified model.

The Bible also teaches of a common language of humanity, claiming that one language existed up until the Babylonian dispersion. Christianity also knows of the return to the proto-language, as when the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles and they spoke in all existing languages at once. The Holy Spirit gave them the special blessing of knowing the original proto-language.

The search for the proto-language in modern linguistics

The idea of reconstructing the proto-language has always excited the minds of the most different people. Many have tried to express their specific views on this matter, but few have managed to forge more or less reliable systems. In fact, such quests have been undertaken by profane Western science as well. Besides the classical line of linguistics which is restricted to the study of language in already existing, historical forms, there also exists in modern linguistics another trend (whose founder was the Italian scholar Trombetti) which proceeds from the assumption of the existence of a single proto-language. Trombetti proved this on the level of positivist facts and believed that the proto-language could be restored. For this he was earnestly criticized. Trombetti's line was continued by Bopp, the Russian scholar Potebnja, the Soviet linguist and academician Marr (who was harshly criticized by another great linguist, Joseph Stalin) and particularly by the outstanding Serbian scholar Illich-Svitych. The latter founded the Nostratic concept which accounted for the criticisms of Trombetti and Bopp's models. Illich-Svitych therein developed the thesis that languages are reducible to four or six roots. He distinguished the Eurasian group (including Semitic, Hamitic, Indo-European, and Kartvelian languages),

the languages of the North American Indians, and the Sino-Tibetan and Paleo-African groups as the four main meta-clusters. Curiously enough, these four groups correspond to the four corners of the world. The far from mystical Illich-Svitych arrived at these conclusions on the basis of an entirely scientific approach, the path of classical, conventional linguistic analysis. This theory was very popular among Soviet linguistics, but remained unknown in the West. This line has since been discontinued, just as science has frozen altogether. This is a pity, as developing this line could have yielded colossal results. It is one of the most promising trends in linguistics.

Individual (unsuccessful) attempts at constructing a proto-language

In the early 1980's, I myself actively tried to arrive at this language in imitating the (as a rule, unsuccessful) endeavors of predecessors. After all, the necessity of a proto-language's existence follows from the Guénonian vision of the Primordial Tradition! Admittedly, I made little progress. I know several languages, including several ancient ones (on a rudimentary level). I tried to somehow systematize the roots and phonetic constructs which seemed to me to be similar. In fact, the Russian scholar Potebnja subjected the Russian language to a similar procedure. To this day, I have a mountain of materials devoted to these experiences. There one can find attempts at reconstructing the proto-language through both mystical alphabets and wholly scholarly linguistic theories. All of this was extremely interesting, took up a lot of my time, but the result was, frankly speaking, pathetic. The ends did not meet. One needs to know much more than I did. Some of the models which I tried to use (including those traceable back to Agrippa Nettesheim [2]) did not stand the test of reliable scientific data.

The revelation of Herman Wirth

And then, suddenly everything changed. I encountered the works of a man who is practically unknown – Herman Wirth. No one knows him in our country, nor do the Traditionalists of the West know him. He is the “great unknown”, le grand inconnu. His works were taken from Berlin by the Soviet Army and for years lay in a storage room where they ended up wet and covered with mold. Nobody had touched them since 1945. I tried unsuccessfully to find Wirth's works in the libraries of several European capitals. Only once, in the Alain de Benoist's underground library bunker did I see one of Herman Wirth's books on a shelf. The owner, however, had paid no special attention to it, which is no surprise, as there was such a volume of books that their owner simply had not yet made his way to Wirth.

I spent two years studying Wirth. For two years I was glued to his works, trying to understand at least something. His works are huge volumes including maps. The text is not structured, everything begins in

the middle and stops mid-sentence. I think no one really read it. To do so, one would have to be a fanatic. Interestingly enough, Julius Evola, who is extremely popular among European Traditionalists, called Wirth one of his three main teachers (alongside Guénon and Guido de Giorgio) in his autobiographical work, *The Path of Cinnabar*. But even after the publication of this book, still no one paid attention to Wirth. Such a strange author. As Guénon wrote, “certain things protect themselves.” There are some items that are laying in the middle of the room in plain sight, but we are incapable of finding them. Modern occultists have even evoked the notion of “black holes” existing everywhere. In fact, everything is more complex and subtle.

As was Herman Wirth. Guénon devoted a very important review to him. Nevertheless, Wirth is unknown, and this despite the fact that even the most insignificant authors mentioned by Guénon or Evola have been devoted in the very least separate studies by Western Traditionalists. But no one in these circles has heard of Wirth.

“We are in search of the stone with runic or prerunic inscriptions”

What comprises Wirth’s ideas, his message? Wirth deciphered the very proto-language which we have been talking about. He did this in a reliable manner without occultist exaggerations and positivist skepticism. No more nor less. His work is maximally close to this language. No one has done more reliable metaphysical, historical, linguistic, or conceptual (if you will) studies of the language of the Primordial Tradition. In my opinion, Wirth did not know Guénon, and I found no citations of him in his works. He read Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the famous Hindu Traditionalist, and cited him. However, Wirth himself was not a Traditionalist. Rather, he was an idealist, a scrupulous scholar and a German patriot. The fact that he did not share the numerous prejudices of occultists who hurry to discredit serious research, only enhances the significance of his works. Looking at Wirth through the eyes of Guénon, we see all that Guénon did not say, but which undoubtedly follows from what he did. Wirth adds an essential part to Guénon’s Traditionalism [5]. Even Evola did not add anything in particular to Guénon. Evola was original, daring, and active, but this rather aesthetic and existential component brought to Traditionalism in fact contains little substance.

What Wirth brought is a startling revelation – sudden, extremely complex, and demanding tremendous attention. This figure so much changed the picture of modern Traditionalism that ignoring him is simply impossible. It is intriguing that although we live on the outskirts of the Traditionalist world, in the bear corner, we are one of the first to approach such important things. In his time, the mysterious author Otto Rahn wrote a book entitled *The Crusade against the Grail* [6] and advanced the following hypothesis: perhaps the Grail was not a chalice, but a stone with certain prerunic inscriptions that are a

universal key to all religious models, and all knowledge in general. Guénon himself wrote (if I'm not mistaken, in *The King of the World* [7]) that there indeed exists a view that the Grail is simultaneously a chalice, a book, and a stone. When Guénon studied the Canterbury megaliths, he said that it is possible that the Grail ought to be understood as a concrete object covered in signs, and that these signs probably represent primordial hieroglyphs. In some sense, Herman Wirth's reconstruction reveals something very similar. In the volumes of research of this German scholar, there is something of a Holy Grail, a Holy Grail of meanings.

Arctida – the cradle of humanity

As a kind of prelude to studying the primordial language, Herman Wirth presents an historical-geographical reconstruction of the first ages of mankind. As a positivist scholar, he draws out a long table of monkeys with different species of animals and geological shifts, but we can disregard this. The most interesting begins at 20,000 B.C. Here Wirth switches over to serious, correct language. He adheres to the ideas of the geologist Wegener.

The modern contours of continents emerged only recently. Continents are not dormant and are not constant masses. They slide along the shelf, and thus the look of the earth was once completely different. There once existed two continents: a Northern one, Arctogaia (Arctida) and a Southern one, Gondwana. Wegener's chronology, which Wirth partially appropriates, is based on the positivist methods of calculating time and transposing modern physical processes onto ancient times, a method which is rather incorrect. Guénon himself has written much [9] about shifts in the cosmic environment in correlation to the unfolding of the cyclical process. But this is not the point.

Wirth argues that Arctida was the cradle of mankind. This is the starting point in Wirth's model. He claims that man originated at the North Pole, i.e., humanity is essentially a polar phenomenon. Hence Nordism as a method, as a vision of the particularities of the primordial language, primordial knowledge, and primordial religion. This is not the North Pole as an abstract concept (such as the mountain Meru), but a real pole where the continent of Arctogaia lay and on which lived amazing people – the Hyperboreans. Contemplating the surrounding world, they developed the proto-language which lies at the heart of the complex of ideas which we have now, many thousands of years later.

This model of Wirth's perfectly corresponds with Guénon's holistic views on humanity's polar origins and the primordial Golden Age. Thus, Wirth's formally positivist research led him to the Nordic theory of man's origin which is classic for Traditionalism. But if Guénon limits himself to merely asserting this as

fact, then Wirth draws conclusions therein of enormous importance. He reasons that we cannot decipher ancient languages and ancient culture, cannot piece together an adequate view of ancient peoples, nor can we find some, so to say, “antediluvian” remnants simply because we do not accept the notion of the northern origin of humanity, do not take into account the fact that the climate in this northern, polar continent was no harsher than the south of modern France. The North Pole was the point from which the rays of civilization spread South.

Affirming this concept, Wirth with ease explains the hang-ups of paleo-anthropology and ancient history. He explains why there are no remains of Nordic man: firstly, because burial forms for Nordic people were different (as was the very quality of their lives), and the lands which they inhabited either shifted or sank. Wirth conducted very interesting research on the shallows of Dogger between Holland and England, where he sought the remains of Arctida which, from his point of view, existed as centers of civilization up to historical times. These explorations yielded colossal results, most of which are, alas, beyond our scope.

The first hieroglyph – the Nordic Year

Now about the primordial language. In Wirth’s view, the main key to understanding this language, and all existing languages and traditions, is the year. The year and man, the year and God, the year and nature, the year and time, the year and space are, in Wirth’s view, synonymous concepts. Man is the embodiment of condensed time. Time in and of itself is a divine manifestation.

The northern, polar cycle is the highest knowledge and, as follows, everything else is to be explained through the calendar. Special attention should be paid to the natural features of the North Pole. We know that a day there lasts not 24 hours, but six months, as does a night. For example, such a notion as the “midnight sun”, which is addressed in many of the Dionysian mysteries and is a generally important element in multiple sacred theories, acquires an entirely natural sense in Arctida – natural-magical meaning. This is the sun that shines at midnight at the North Pole during the summer solstice. Indeed, there is sun, and there is midnight. The memory of this midnight sun, like the memory of the primordial homeland of our ancestors, has been preserved in traditional models and been passed down from generation to generation in the form of legends and stories.

There is a fundamental difference between the daily and yearly cycles. We, living south of the polar latitude (22 degrees North), imagine the year as divided into days. But the man of polar origin saw the year differently. The day of the gods was equal to a year of people, which means that the difference

between the divine and human was erased. There was no difference to be distinguished between the created and uncreated; there was no difference between subject and object or divine and natural revelation. Nature was a fact of the Divine, and the Divine was an inner dimension of nature. There existed a kind of “polar-paradisaal worldview” in which the spirit was to be found at both the center and the periphery.

Wirth employed the structure of the polar year, or the year as a set of natural phenomenon characteristic of the northern, polar regions, as a universal instrument for interpreting all other elements. The first people were not comical, semi-finished products from classical evolutionary textbooks, and they did not see the world as primitive and flat. This was something completely different. The most diverse concepts, objects, creatures, situations, scenarios, and rituals boil down to a single paradigm. For Wirth, such a method of explaining everything through the paradigm of the year – the polar year – was the starting point of his ambitious studies.

The first calendar model

This is the basic model of the annual polar cycle. It might seem that there is nothing special here. The only particularity is that the South is identified strictly with winter, the East with spring, the North with summer, and fall with the West. In the annual circle, the sun goes in a different direction than in the daily one.

p04

Figure 1: “N – summer, E – spring, S – Winter, W – autumn”; Figure 2: “N – day, E – morning, S – night, W – evening”

In this, in Wirth’s view, is contained great historical and historic-gnoseological drama.

Ancient humanity, according to Wirth and Tilak, moved south for a number of reasons. For example, in the Bundahishn (the sacred Zoroastrian book), it is said that “the red serpent of Ahriman sent cold to the blessed country of the Aryans and the city of Vara where the primordial white people lived, and they were forced to leave their homes.” So what happened then?

The polar cycles’ yearly phenomenon stop below the 22 degrees northern latitude. Man no longer plainly sees evidence of the primordial calendar-topographical model and does not understand the

direct meaning of what was so obvious before. He loses the key to interpreting certain signs and schemes in which movement towards summer and movement upwards mean movement northwards.

Everything is inverted in the ordinary daily cycle, and all the phenomena that lie at the heart of the primordial language and the primordial proto-religion are obscured. Accordingly, mythological elements, and language itself, are now interpreted differently. There is an overlap between at least two cycles. In one – the annual, global, Nordic cycle – movement is counter-clockwise, whereas in the other – the daily one – movement is clockwise. It is by virtue of this that these two sacred paradigms (the daily and yearly) change places and (pay attention to how serious this is!) there is a transition from God to man and from the day of gods to the day of people.

As follows, the symbolic details of the primordial code, the primordial language and paradigm of religious knowledge change places. We lose the key to understanding them. This, according to Herman Wirth, is the Babylonian dispersal of languages. We lost the ciphers of the Nordic worldview, and the miasma of the southern seas begin to penetrate our consciousness. We increasingly become mere people to the point that we reach today's dismal, critical state. There is probably no lower.

Also important is the hieroglyph of the Celtic cross, the circle with four orientations, which is the first calendar.

p05

Figure 3: "N – summer, E – spring, S – Winter, W – autumn"

The very notion of a calendar is a very sacred thing. A calendar is a visual model which condenses and clearly displays two concepts: time and space. In a calendar, time is displayed synchronously and simultaneously. What man is given in progressive development is given in a calendar, and only in a calendar, as a possibility of simultaneous setting. Thus, contemplating over the Nordic calendar, meditating on it is one of the most direct ways of making contact with Eternity. When man looks at the calendar, he grasps all time together as his internal quality, and the nature of perceiving the most simple objects changes. He sees a circle, how time turns into space, and how space, thanks to time, acquires orientation. This is very important, because space itself has no orientation without such a calendar; it is insufficient. The cross which establishes these orientations can thus be depicted anywhere.

Thanks to this calendric perception of the world, what happens in this space undergoes some kind of relativization. In the first lecture, we spoke of the transition from qualitative (sacred) space to quantitative (non-sacred, profane) space. Sacred space, furnished with qualitatively meaningful orientations, arises out of the most complex Nordic operation of bringing time into space ("spatializing time", so to speak).

The main compass of these sacred, qualitative orientations is the calendar.

The point of the North is one, the South point is another, the point of East the third, and the point of the West the fourth. Each of these points of space corresponds to a certain, strictly fixed sign. If we impose the circle of time onto this space, then it shows all possible mutations of space as if grasping the eternal movement of the four directions in one fixed picture.

Interestingly enough, the problem of squaring the circle and perpetuum mobile ("perpetual motor") which recently completely puzzled the best men of science, is in fact a distant echo of this Nordic knowledge expressed in this simple figure.

Today football fans wear the Celtic cross on their scarves without knowing what colossal meaning this symbol has. It is also depicted on targets for shooting. In the 1960's, the Belgian Jean Thiriart made the Celtic cross the emblem of his Young Europe (his pan-European national movement) which was later adopted by football fans and skinheads, since which he has been constantly present in their symbols.

Take another look at the Celtic cross.

The sequence is built into the cycle. The line becomes the circle. Eternal movement is provided by the representation of all time at once. It cannot end and cannot be stopped. It cannot disappear. It is some kind of absolute paradigm, the essence of being, expressed graphically.

Such was Herman Wirth's first step towards revealing the structure of the proto-language.

Already at this stage we can arrive at numerous conclusions of incredible value. Can every situation, every event, and every mythological tale or everyday scenario be dissected using this model?

How do we act, how do we live? Under the sign of the North? Or under the sign of the West? Under the sign of the East? Or under the sign of the South? Along the downward arc or the rising one? Towards what are things gravitating? Towards the sky and summer or towards winter and earth?

Upon applying this paradigm to the most complex cults and theological constructions, we will always find whole layers of meanings, the existence of which we knew nothing of before. Even if Wirth had stopped here, this alone would have already been very serious and very much, as we would be given a clue. But he went further...

Part two coming soon...

Footnotes:

[1] R.Guénon, "Le Roi du Monde", Paris, 1993, "Le Regne de la Quantite et les Signes des Temps", Paris, 1995, "Formes traditionnelles et cycles cosmiques", Paris, 1995.

[2] H.C.Agrippa, "La philosophie occulte", Paris, 1981.

[3] J.Evola, "Il camino del cinabro", Milano, 1972

Herman Wirth: Runes, Great Yule, and the Arctic Homeland

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

[The foreword to Signs of the Great North: The Hyperborean Theory (Moscow, Veche: 2008); originally an episode of Dugin's "Historico-Magical Meditative Radio Show" FINIS MUNDI]

There exists no greater mystery in human existence than the mystery of life and death, dying and becoming. For man, the Year is the supreme Revelation of divine action in the Universe. The Year is the expression of God's providential cosmic law, in accordance with which occurs the becoming of the world in the infinite and everlasting return. The most magical and profound phenomenon before us in nature is the Year of God. A number of days makes up the Year, and in each of these days is opened the image of the Year: the birth of the Light from which comes all life, its climb to the highest peak, and its descent, death, and sinking, only to rise again. The morning, noon, evening, and night in a day correspond to spring, summer, autumn, and winter in the Year.

In spring, the "Light of the World" once again awakens all life, rectifies, and develops until it reaches its full deployment and limit of growth at the noon-summer time, then to once again begin the path to night and winter, preparing for death, after which inevitably follows new birth. The Nordic man beheld the image of his existence daily and yearly: early in the morning was his childhood, later his youth, then at noon and in the summer was his maturing, full maturity, and then the decay of life and old age leading to the winter of death, and through this to new life, to the rebirth and new becoming embodied in offspring. The cycle of the day reflects in its permanent and uninterrupted repetition the yearly cycle, as the Year is the circle of human life. The cycle, circular motion, and rotation itself is the supreme cosmic law of God, the ethical Foundation of the Universe of all beings. On this principle rests every consideration of God and every sense of justice. The law of eternal rotation, whose expressions are space and time, especially realized in the Year, were recognized by the Atlanto-Nordic race in the symbol of the Year and World Tree, the Tree of Life.

These words are from the book of the great Dutch scholar, Herman Wirth. His name can be mentioned to few modern men, even highly educated people, and his works cannot be found in modern university libraries, but the reason for this will be understood later. Nevertheless, Herman Wirth was one of those people who in our century, in this dark period of the Iron Age, the Kali Yuga, did an astonishing amount for the restoration of the Great Tradition from the time of the Golden Age and the mysterious region of Hyperborea – the magical, Apollonian land lying in the Far North. René Guénon and Julius Evola spoke of the Primordial Tradition and the polar paradise, and their names are known to all Traditionalists. But very few know of Herman Wirth even though this tall, thin professor, modest and passionate like any genuine scholar, discovered the secret of secrets of this Primordial Tradition, reconstructed its language, revealed the secrets of the ancient runes, and deciphered the message of the Golden Age.

This may seem incredible, but it is a fact. Herman Wirth did no more and no less than recreate the “Sacred Proto-Language of Humanity”, *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit*, the very name of one of his thick, astounding, fundamental books.

Herman Wirth was born in 1885 in Utrecht, the Netherlands. His family descended from a line of ancient Frisians, the inhabitants of the northern regions of Holland differing to this day in their unusual height and classical Indo-European facial features. From his childhood, Wirth was interested in the history of his country and his people. He collected tales and legends, and attentively studied the signs and symbols which decorated the homes of ordinary Dutch peasants.

Wirth explored his entire country far and wide. In 1910, he defended his thesis entitled *The Degradation of Dutch Folk Song* and already in this first work surprised others with his incredible erudition, which subjected to analysis practically all available material relating to Dutch folklore. Moreover, he attempted to construct a general model, a kind of proto-mythology that stood behind all folk art and which could help one better understand the holistic worldview of the ancient ancestors. Proceeding from the symbols and elements of Dutch antiquity, Wirth expanded the range of his ethnographic, cultural, symbolical searches first to all the Germanic lands, and then broader to Europe, Eurasia, and, finally, to the regions most distant from Europe itself: America, Oceania, Africa, and so on. In search of a formula that could generalize the worldview of the ancient Aryan ancestors, Wirth moved in a spiral, clarifying, correcting, extending, or re-considering all the information hitherto gathered by linguists, archaeologists, historians of religion and art, anthropologists, etc. His endeavor was one of incredible intensity.

Herman Wirth mastered a few hundred – just imagine, a few hundred! – ancient languages, seeking to find in them some kind of common patterns dating back to forgotten times. The models that Wirth developed anticipated the “Nostratic theory” of Illich-Svitych which appeared only much later, according to which the populations of Europe, Asia, and Africa spoke the same language at the dawn of humanity.

But Herman Wirth was unique by virtue of more than just his dazzling intellect. Unlike the positivist scientific community, he categorically disagreed with confining oneself to small spaces and spending one’s entire life clarifying and double-checking minor details, as was accepted practice among scholarly circles in the “critical,” pessimistic century. Wirth, like the scholars of the Middle Ages, strove to cover an enormous field of knowledge at one time. His approach was not analytical, but synthetic. Therefore, for a fundamental historical hypothesis he appeals not to chaotic and isolated fragments of modern anthropologists’ studies which idolize fact, but to ancient myths, Tradition, and sacred sources. Like René Guénon, Wirth understood that the modern world is an anomaly, regression, and

degeneration, and that truth is to be sought in myths, symbols, legends, religions, cults, rites, and folklore.

Yima – the First Man – acted on the advice of Ahura Mazda and built the city of Vara in the Far North surrounded by a wall and brought there the seeds of all the best from people, animals, and plants to preserve them from the fatal winter, the punishment of the spirit of evil, Angra Mainyu, descending upon the sacred land of happiness. Yima built the city of the golden arrow and made the gates luminescent and others into lights. And Spitama Zarathustra asked Ahura Mazda: ‘O creator of the material world, worthy decreer of the Aryans and builder of Asha! What are these lights in the city built by Yima?’ And Ahura Mazda replied: ‘These lights are both eternal and transient. Only once a year do they rise and descend in the city of Vara, the Stars, Moon, and the Sun. The city’s inhabitants believe the whole year to be one Day.

This fragment from the Bundahishn, the sacred book of the Zoroastrians, can be interpreted in different ways, as can many of Tradition’s other indications that in the Far North in forgotten times there existed an amazing country of paradise, Hyperborea (Thule, Varahi) where the joyful ancestors of the golden-haired, blue-eyed Aryans lived, the divine race of kings and heroes. Herman Wirth treated Tradition’s message literally, and this allowed him to create a unique theory of the origin of mankind, “*Der Aufgang der Menschheit*,” decipher ancient signs, explain the secret, unfathomable sides of archaic symbols, cults, and rituals, grasp the meaning of sacred rites, and restore the long-lost alphabet of the humanity of paradise. This may seem impossible. Why has such a fantastic discovery remained unnoticed by the general public? How can such stunning, breathtaking revelations be passed over? Why are both ordinary people and the scientific community not told of such a scholar’s name? Alas, once again, political incorrectness. Herman Wirth had the temerity to join at a young age the patriotic national movement of Holland, and later Germany. Wirth was the inspiration behind the Dutch youth movement, *Dietske Trekvogels*, an analogue of the German *Wandervogel*. This was a broad youth organization whose members visited rural areas, collected national folklore, and invested the typical revolutionary enthusiasm of youth into a paradoxical interest in the archaic. They hated the modern world, the commercial spirit of cities and stock exchanges, and the cynical attitude of the corrupt cosmopolitan hell into which Europe had inexorably slipped by the beginning of the 20th century. The anarchism of the *Wandervogel* was coupled with love for their people, the customs of their ancestors, and Tradition. By the 1930’s, this tendency could not but become a component part of another political movement whose name alone draws feelings of terror among today’s well-intentioned citizens. The ideas and works of Herman Wirth, the great restorer and discoverer of the most ancient proto-language of humanity, became unfortunately associated with a political regime that became extremely unpopular after the mid 1940’s. In the end, the North and its light, its people, its Tradition, and its symbols henceforth became politically incorrect.

Herman Wirth formulated the foundations of his theory in 1928 in his work *Der Aufgang der Menschheit* ("The Ascent of Mankind"). He believed that all the mentions of the ancient continent lying at the North Pole are not myths or fantasies, but historical fact. To confirm this hypothesis, he referred to the writings of modern geologists, in particular Wegener, according to whom continents are not in constant rest, but are constantly sliding along the shelf and can therefore move around the globe over fairly large intervals of time. Once upon a time, in the North Pole there existed a continent where different atmospheric conditions reigned. Memory of this continent was preserved in ancient legends, myths, and tales, etc. It is from this continent that the spiritual culture of humanity united in a common formula began to spread.

The basis of this culture, this Hyperborean cult, was not simply the Year, but the Year beheld in polar conditions in which a month lasts six months and six months a night. According to Herman Wirth, descriptions of the Polar Year lay at the heart of all sacred texts and cults, symbols, and signs from the cave paintings and first markings on mammoth bones to the most refined and sophisticated theological and mystical constructs. This fact, which other modern historians of religion and anthropologists had not considered, can be explained very simply. If we merely apply calendric cult circles to the primordial conditions of the lands on which we encounter the remains of ancient cultures, such as Sumer, India, Eurasia, the Pyrenees, the Mediterranean, the Middle East, etc., then it is impossible to trace genuine correspondences since only part of the hieroglyphs remain unchanged since Hyperborean, polar times, while a portion were constructed under new, non-polar and non-arctic circumstances. The real key to interpreting ancient symbols is given only by accepting the hypothesis of a polar, nordic origin of civilization. But this hypothesis had never been seriously considered by anyone.

"A Day of the Gods equals one human year" – this assertion can be found in the Rig Veda, the Avesta, Ancient Greek myths, the Germanic sagas, Sumerian epics, and in archaic fragments of the Bible. The German Professor Herman Wirth took this literally and thus proceeded to make an incredible, unheard of discovery.

The first people were not Neanderthaloid idiots huddling in caves and poking each other with sticks as Darwinists, Marxists, and other profane thinkers assert. They were fully-fledged human beings with a refined, simple, yet ultimately spiritual worldview. They were the bearers of the Supreme Religion of Light, Purity, and the Spirit. They did not know of a detached Creator God acting on humanity and nature as if on something external. The whole world was permeated with divine energies, and people themselves were seen as children of the Sun, descendants of Gods, as angelic, supreme beings professing a particular world view, a God-worldview, or *Gottesweltanschauung*. They did not need morality or laws insofar as moral and religious law was in them. These were tall, blond-haired and blue-eyed beings for whom ill thoughts, the spirit of greed, lust for power, and other subhuman defects were alien. Interestingly enough, Wirth was for some time close to the Dutch Communists, in whose plans he

saw a return to the primordial, supreme, Nordic system. Of course, the Nordic-Aryan communism of Professor Wirth somewhat differed from the Marxian utopia. Wirth put forth the theory of a polar “proto-monotheism,” a “proto-God.” All elements of this most ancient ritual were in strict accordance with the harmony of cosmic Nature. There were no strict barriers between the human, natural, social, religious, and temporal.

Dualism was unknown. Thought and matter, spirit and substance, the particular and the whole, the natural and the social, and the divine and non-divine all existed in total harmony and determined a single formula, knowledge of which can be deciphered by not only linguistic and symbolic figures – products of artificial human origin – but the language of nature, the voices of animals, plants, rocks, and mountains. Here Wirth ultimately transcends the materialism generally accepted at the time in scholarly circles. He believed that the great sacred formula lying at the heart of polar civilization was not simply a description of the external world, but magical thought itself given flesh. “God creates thinking”, Wirth quotes the famous phrase of an Icelandic runic song. Knowledge is Being, both coinciding and each having no right to eminency. Therefore, to understand and to create are one and the same. Tradition is not an aggregate simply describing historical facts, but an absolutely living thing that is outside time and space. He who is able to reveal its secrets, changes not simply in the sense of broadening his knowledge, but is transformed within. Such an approach might be understood by believers, but not highbrowed and snobby professors with crooked mouths and short brains accustomed to believing poisonous doubt and selfish skepticism to be the scientific norm.

Germany’s scientific community ganged up on Herman Wirth. His ideas were regarded as extravagant and too radical. Essentially no objections were brought forth to seriously converse with this great erudite scholar, as all that was necessary was possessing qualities that opponents simply do not have. The main criticisms leveled concerned the “idealistic” approach and excessive trust which Wirth supposedly put in sacred sources. But today, after the research of Dumézil, Eliade, Lévi-Strauss, Kerényi, Jung, etc., scholars’ doubts back then seem to be completely unfounded. But the positivist approach still dominated then. Nevertheless, Wirth paid little attention to the attacks by his colleagues and continued to explore the Nordic Tradition and ascertain the secret formula, knowledge of which, in his opinion is, like Archimedes’ lever, capable of changing the world.

In studying the proto-language of humanity, Herman Wirth reached the astonishing conclusion that runic writing and especially the runic calendric circles discovered in Northern Europe are the remnants of Hyperborean proto-writing. They are not distorted Latin or a degenerate variant of the Mediterranean Phoenician alphabet. On the contrary, they are traces of the great symbolic circle out of which other historical alphabets developed much later, including the Phoenician one, which boasts no supremacy over other types of writing. But runes and their meaning can be understood only by accepting the hypothesis of the existence of the Polar Continent, Hyperborea, as their meaning, name,

and distribution on calendric circles reveal their sense only in relation to the natural phenomenon that take place in the Arctic. Scholars have therefore been incapable of putting the pieces of this historical puzzle together and weave together the different details of archaeological and anthropological glimpses. Of course, primordial runes greatly differed from those known today. But they can be restored. In the thousands of pages he authored, Herman Wirth examined thousands of illustrations, ancient symbols, rock carvings, patterns on ancient household items, pottery, various tools, etc. All of this brings us closer to the much sought secret, the original runic circle.

The center of this circle is the winter solstice. The Great Yule is the main celebration of the Hyperborean Year. In it is the secret of the runes and the Primordial Tradition. In Hyperborea, Yule was celebrated on December 22nd. On December 22nd every year, the true New Year arrived, the moment of the birth of the runes, the moment of the Eternal Return, the second in which Hyperborea stood outside of time and space, pulled away from the cycles of the dark age, the confusion in the South, false theories, and miserable neglect of Supreme Magical Purity...Vara, Varahi, Ultima Thule...

Herman Wirth argued that the secrets of the runes were originally kept not by male priests, but priestesses. White Ladies. Weise Frau – Weisse Frau. The words “wisdom”, “woman,” and “white” are indeed closely related in many languages. Pallas is the Goddess of Wisdom, and the Sophia of the Gnostics is also an embodiment of knowledge and the feminine element in the Divine. The Russian word *mudrost'* (wisdom) is similar to the German *Made*, *Madchen* or *Maiden*, *Girl*. Hence the ancient cult of the vestal virgins, the keepers of the sacred fire in Rome. Here we should also include the practice of the female priesthood in the early Christian church, and the Old Believers' theory of “salvation through one's wife.” Following Bachofen, Herman Wirth claimed that the Primordial Tradition was none other than matriarchal. It was the realm of the White Lady, the Pure Virgin. The primordial Nordic Pantheon was headed by a Goddess – not female in our patriarchal understanding of a capricious, stupid, cruel, and demanding being – but as the special, Most Pure Creation, a kind of Androgyne standing beyond dualism, its spiritual intuition penetrating the essence of things. The Polar Paradise, the Aryan race, the Primordial Tradition, the domination of the White Lady, the guardians of the runic cults and priestess of the dolmens and menhirs – for Wirth these are synonyms. Wirth thus insists on the primordial matriarchy of the polar Tradition.

In practice, this manifested itself in him professing a particular form of “Germanic Aryan Feminism.” The following picture of sacred archetypes in history is developed in Wirth's work: Primordial matriarchy is deemed intrinsic to the northern peoples, the first bearers of culture. The other tribes of the earth received from them the foundations of cults, language, ritual, and myth. But as a result of mixing with the peoples of the South, the messengers of the North gradually lost Tradition's proportions, forgot the meaning of the runes, and tweaked their religious-calendric rituals under new natural conditions. With this arose the new institute of priesthood in which the main role is henceforth played by men. The

Germanic peoples, and especially the ancestors of the Dutch and the Frisians, were the last upholders of Aryan matriarchy, although other Indo-European peoples who adopted the practice of determining their identity through the mother's line did belong to this category. These are the legendary Tuatha Dé Danann, the "tribes of the goddess Danu" from the Irish sagas, the Frisians as the "children of Freya", etc. Gradually mixed cultural forms thus yielded patriarchy, which came to be perfected among Middle Eastern ethnai, especially the Semitic peoples.

Indo-European civilizations themselves came to be subjected to the influence of these new cults. The Ancient Hyperborean priestess institutions were abolished, demonized, or reduced to vestigial forms.

These ideas cost Herman Wirth very much. In the 1920's, when he began presenting and widely promoting his Aryan-feminist views, he found himself an implacable enemy in the face of an immigrant from Russia's Baltic lands, a certain Alfred Rosenberg who, on the contrary, believed patriarchy to be an indigenous Aryan institution. Unlike Wirth, Rosenberg was a pedant, a mediocrity, and aggressive plagiarist. But it was not even about his ideas...Herman Wirth was the archetype of a passionate scholar, a visionary, and seer. Rosenberg was a pathetic doctrinaire who regurgitated undigested fragments of knowledge and pretentiously arranged these scraps in his rash and meaningless book *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*. Unfortunately, it was this Baltic official embroiled in resentment who happened to determine the cultural police of the National Socialists who won in 1933. It is no wonder that afterwards the best intellectual and spiritual forces of the German Conservative Revolution – such people as Junger, Heidegger, Hielcher, and Wirth himself – were finally pushed into the opposition camp.

In 1932, German Wirth founded a society for the study of ancient cultures under the name *Ancestors' Heritage*, or *Ahnenerbe*. In 1933, this organization came under the control of Heinrich Himmler, who was Rosenberg's main opponent and rival among the Nazi leadership. For all this time, Herman Wirth continued his intense research into elucidating the secrets of the origin of mankind, language, ancient cultures, and primordial cults. The *Ahnenerbe* organized unique expeditions to the North Sea where, Wirth presumed, the traces of the ancient civilizations of the Hyperboreans were supposed to remain – such as in Dogger Bank or Dogger Shallows, the lands flooded relatively recently, altogether some 12,000 years ago. According to Wirth's reconstruction, these are the lands of Ponseti or Forseti, Forsetiland, a remnant of the even more ancient continent of Mo-Uru. The expeditions acquired unique findings. In parallel, Wirth directed Schaeffer's expedition to Tibet to check his hypothesis on the preservation of remains of Hyperborean culture in the Gobi desert and Western Tibet, in the mountainous land of Shan, the homeland of the Bon religion.

The Ahnenerbe juxtaposed enormous amounts of archaeological, paleo-epigraphical, as well as ethnological and linguistic materials at the organization's disposal. Unique research unprecedented in scale and depth was carried out. Moreover, the majority of the Ahnenerbe's leaders did not at all share the official regime's totalitarianism and chauvinism. In the opinion of Wirth and his pupils, the descendants of the Hyperboreans, or pure Aryans, are currently among all of the earth's peoples regardless of skin color, and Europeans, including Germans, were not vested with any kind of superiority in this regard. All of this inevitably led Wirth into the opposition. Wirth's pupil and disciple, Wolfram Sievers and Friedrich Hielscher became the heads of an anti-Hitler conspiracy. They helped numerous persecuted people, including Jews, escape and relocate to safe places. Unsurprisingly, while head of the Ahnenerbe in 1938, Herman Wirth, not being a member of the National Socialist German Workers Party, was removed from his office and put under scrupulous surveillance by the Gestapo. His home was searched and many valuable artifacts were taken from his personal collection. His whole endeavor was thus ruined by conformists and idiots. Alas, this repeats itself constantly in history. One only has to demonstrate some kind of unique, lively, creative, fantastic, avant-garde initiative for thick, sullenly stupid, envious, and incompetent scum to grossly ruin the whole thing. Just as in science, thus it is in politics and art. The only true racism would be that directed against aggressive mediocrities and vain but swift empty heads, members of the ubiquitous "conspiracy of mediocrities", the secret order of those with average capabilities united to constantly and invariably destroy the glorious plans of heroes and geniuses.

And so, Herman Wirth fell into disgrace and came under supervision by the secret police. If not for the intervention of his friend and colleague, a sophisticated mystic and lover of antiquity, Walter Darré, Wirth would not have avoided a concentration camp. But what do you do? Alas, this is the dark age, the triumph of lies and dishonesty. Injustice is the law of the epoch when the wheel of Dharma flies off of its axis...

Herman Wirth explained everything, such as why there exists the custom of putting up a Christmas tree. It turns out that this is a very ancient ritual, in which the tree symbolizes the World Tree, whose origins date back to the point of the winter solstice, the shortest day, and the crown at the top is the summer solstice, June 22nd. The months in a year are the branches and the ornaments are days. The spruce is the eternally green tree, in this respect similar to the Year or the biblical Burning Bush. The year moves, but remains the same just as pine needles do not change their color over the course of the year. The burning bush on Mount Sinai burns, but does not burn out. Wirth traces the Russian name for spruce, *yel*, back the ancient root *ii* or *ei*, referring to Light and the Divine as well as sacred artifacts symbolizing Light. The gifts placed under the Christmas tree are the New Year, the new world, fresh and full of new energy. There also exists the custom of stuffing boots or stockings with gifts. These are meant to not be matching. This symbolizes the fact that Time crosses the magical line of Yule with one foot, the winter solstice, while the other leg is left in the old year. The lights on the tree represent the sun at different stages of its yearly movement. For this very same reason, Ded Moroz's (or Santa Claus') red coat depicts

a large, solar circle. Ded Moroz himself once represented a Light Deity, the Ancient-in-Days. Later his functions were taken over by Saint Nicholas the Wonderworker whose holiday is celebrated by the Church shortly before the winter solstice. Even the downward-slanted branches of the tree, according to Wirth, have symbolic meaning. This repeats the runic sign Tiu, the man with down-stretched hands. This symbolizes the half of the year over the course of which the polar sun descends downwards spirally to the dark regions of night. According to Wirth, Tiu, Tyr, and Tuisto are not simply the names of ancient deities in German paganism. After all, paganism was a perversion of the ancient proto-monotheism which came along with patriarchal usurpation. The Aryan ancestors never recognized the existence of separate, individualized deities. They worshipped the One World imbued with the presence of the One God whose signs of manifestation changed, unfolding in time and space, but while remaining essentially the same, the Self. Paganism arose out of the crisis of the primordial Nordic matriarchy. The White Lady, the Snow Queen, and our Snegurochka paradoxically turn out to be figures more ancient and more authentic than Ded Moroz. The True Mistress of the Great Yule, the winter solstice, is die Weisse Frau, die Weise Frau. She immaculately gives birth in this fantastic moment to the New Divine Eon, the New Year, the new God. It all fits together. It is no coincidence that Herman Wirth called the primordial Hyperborean tradition the somewhat strange combination of "polar Christianity".

The New Year. The Great Yule. The rune tiu, i.e., the man with down-stretched hands, descends to the roots of the World Tree. This is the point of death. This is the center of hell. And in the Christian tradition, Satan himself is distinguished by all the features of the symbolic complex describing the signs of the winter solstice. Satan and devils have tails and tridents. Have you ever wondered why? Because the trident pointed downwards is the rune ig, the clear sign of the roots of the World Tree. And this rune is found at the point of the winter solstice. Such is also the meaning of the Greek Neptune's trident.

The underworld in mythology is associated with being underwater, as in Lithuanian, in which jura means sea. The devils' tails complement their bipedalism up to the fullness of the sacred sign. In fact, Satan limps for the same reason that a stocking with gifts is put by the Christmas tree for children. And the devils' tridents, with which they actively stir their sinners in their cauldrons (which in themselves are also symbols of Yule) finally complete the picture. They are black and live underground. The fire of hell is an infernal version of the Christmas Lights, etc. Thanks to Herman Wirth's formula, one can interpret all ancient and modern folklore and theology, the meaning of rites, and even the message of Nature. And this is embodied in the primordial Hyperborean language whose beginning was God. Gott ist Angang jeglicher Sprache. Martin Heidegger argued something similar when he said that Poetry lies at the basis of language. According to Wirth, language is not an instrument for formulating messages and expressions, but is in itself the higher Message and most important Expression. But modern people are deaf to this reality. They crudely and in a utilitarian manner use what furnishes first decoding, consciousness, understanding and only then – in fact, then you don't want to tolerate and listen to all of this nonsense to which you've become so accustomed and which seems to us to be something familiar and obvious. But this is a propos; let us return again to the devils.

After all, it is known that on New Years night, the forces of hell rise up out of the ground to harass and frighten the two-legged. Everything that Gogol wrote is pure truth, and he even left out a lot that we would regret. And so, devils have horns. But why? Herman Wirth says that this is another rune, the rune ka, the man with raised hands and two upward-angled lines. These luminous horns are depicted on Moses' brow. Two raised hands are also an Egyptian hieroglyph denoting a resurrecting soul. And in Egyptian it sounds – don't be surprised – the same as the typical Icelandic rune ka. Thus, Death is tiu, and Resurrection is ka. The sacrificial descent into hell precedes the Great Yule, after which follows the victorious ascent. Before this magical point, God – the Light of the World – the Christmas Tree – Man – Priest – Priestess – the White Lady lower their hands. Tiu. Afterwards, their hands are lifted up. Ka or Kai. The birth of the new.

This is the meaning of initiation – transitioning from the old to the new, from the profane to the enlightened, from the mortal to the immortal, from the material to the spiritual. The Great Yule is the moment of initiation, dedication. Inside the heart, inside the small ventricle of the heart, in the cave, in a manger, in the place of the Brahma is born a new being, homo novus, Sonnenmensch.

Herman Wirth's work is the metaphysics of the New Year, the reconstruction of the New Language – the unified Language which was spoken before the dispersion of Babel. This is the Nordic glossolalia, systematized and explained. All Kabbalistic designs, not to mention the pathetic attempts of modern occultism, fade before such a picture. Wirth operates with realities much more ancient than the emergence of the Ancient Hebrew or Phoenician writing systems which are in official Mediterranean scholarship considered to be the most culturally ancient. Herman Wirth easily interprets the Bible, every one of its tales, all of its linguistic difficulties, every symbol, and every passage. All the theology of Leviticus collapses before our very eyes. The Old Testament is a detailed narrative of the primordial Tradition and the Hyperborean formula, but not the only and unique one. Rather, it is one equal among other mythological constructs such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Greek, Iranian, Slavic, and Germanic mythologies, and the myths of the Indians, Malays, Africans, and peoples of Oceania. The ritual tattoos of the Maori peoples, the special initiatic language of their wisemen, and the West African alphabet of the Bamun script all suggest a divine reality that is just as clear (and perhaps even clearer) as the amazing and poetic passages of the Torah. In fact, Herman Wirth dedicated his enormous book of more than 1000 pages, *Palestinabuch*, to this subject. But, alas, no one, no matter how much they desire, can read it. In 1969, it was stolen from the old professor's home by unknown assailants. Someone really did not want this veritable interpretation of the Old Testament to exist, even in manuscript form.

In 1945, Herman Wirth, after seven years of Gestapo surveillance, was interned in a concentration camp. What was left of his collection by the Gestapo beasts was destroyed by the "civilized" Americans.

For two years, Herman Wirth – a sworn enemy of narrow German chauvinism and a member of the anti-Hitler underground – went through tortuous and humiliating de-Nazification. But the victors were not interested in nuances. They were even less concerned about the spiritual proto-language of humanity, the Northern ancestral home, the pre-Babel language, and the secrets of the runes. One side of the winners was not interested in anything more than money and comfort, while the other half was completely absorbed in its own totalitarianism and Engels' illusory and rather simpleminded constructs. The very fact that Herman Wirth was a "Nordicist" and held to the theory of "cultural circles" (Kulturkreise), which was considered an indicator of "misanthropy", proved to be sufficient grounds to expunge his name from official scholarship along with Klages, Baeumler, Kossina, Teudt, Horbiger, and others. Wirth was still lucky, however, as his disciple and successor Wolfram Sievers – who was also a leading member of the underground involved in an assassination attempt on Hitler and preparing an assassination attempt on Himmler – was altogether executed as a result of the Nuremberg Trials. But in the era of the Winter Solstice, in the midst of the Polar Night, such an outcome is natural.

Heidegger said: "Modern people are so far removed from the light of Being that they are unaware that they live in darkness. In complete absence of Light, the darkness itself ceases to be darkness for sake of nothing for comparison." Wirth argued the same point, only he identified Light and Being with understanding the Divine Year, the source of language, thought, symbols, and spiritual teachings. Herman Wirth wrote:

The sacred meaning of the Year is completely unknown to modern, city-dwelling man. For him the year is only an abstract, temporal understanding in no way different from all other intervals of time along which modern "socio-economic" life operates. The year is known to him only on the calendar, in business records, and wardrobe changes. Modern urban man is no longer in step with the rhythm of creation. His encounter with the God Year in nature occurs only sporadically, during vacation or natural disasters. In order to return to the experience of the Year, modern man must "recover" from his civilized existence that is separated from the experience of being. As the pace of work and life is becoming faster, even the gap with the more human Year, with the cycle of man's Destiny-Life, is increasing. In need of "recovering" are none other than those "social" people who, freed from all the natural laws of the God Year, turn night into day, and day into night, and make "optimal use of time" while they are in fact killing time. The God Year in nature refreshed men, but they can no longer find an inner path to it. If they understood its very meaning, they would have never set off in mad pursuit of Mammon, making money into a goal of life; they would have not started believing that senseless industrialization and the enlargement of cities is inevitable; and they would not be mired in such deep materialism that seals the poverty, weakness, and nothingness of their soul, the soul of 'modern humanity.' The main reason for all ills is modern men's fall from the eternal rhythm of the God Year. They themselves do not live, but are lived by something extraneous, something alien. They rot in their bodies and souls and grow old even in youth.

Herman Wirth lived to a very old age and died in 1981. His whole life was struggle, selfless activism, and preparing Spiritual Revolution. Not long before his death, he said in an interview to a small regional German journal, *Humus*: "Mein Leben ist immer geistige Revolutions-Arbeit gewesen" ("My life has always been working towards Spiritual Revolution"). Like all heroes in dark times, on the external level he was met with defeat, but on the spiritual level with Triumph and Victory. The blacker the night, the closer are the rays of the Golden Dawn, *Aurora Consurgens*. Among us lived a man who revealed great secrets, the secret cyphers of the Past, a man who reconstructed in its entirety the language of the great Primordial Tradition, but who remains virtually unknown, unnoticed, misunderstood, and unread. Despite the fact that Julius Evola called Herman Wirth one of his three teachers (along with Guénon and Guido de Giorgio), and despite the fact that Guénon himself dedicated a most important review of the cycles and symbolism of human races to Wirth, Traditionalists to this day altogether ignore this great author. This is so strange that it even arouses suspicion. Are even the chosen ones in the shadows and shroud of cosmic midnight? Does their carelessness and desire to at any price hold on to imaginary orthodoxy not expose their own parody and fraud?

But Herman Wirth's work has not been lost. The Light of the North beats in our hearts. The Snow Queen has taken our souls and enchanted them with the spells of polar dreams. There, in the Arctic night, in Arctogaia, we, under the initiatic name of Kai – the resurrected, risen, and belonging to the spring half of the Divine Year – piece together out of icicles the magic word, *EWIGKEIT*, the favorite word of the German professor, Herman Wirth.

Political Platonism: The Philosophy of Politics

Ethnosociology: The Foundations

Until a few months ago, I knew very little about Alexander Dugin despite coming across references to him with increasing frequency. This ignorance was partly the result of the nature of those very references, which have been ambiguous to say the least. “National Bolshevik,” “NazBol,” and “Eurasianist,” were just three of the terms I’d heard in relation to Dugin, each rather arcane yet retaining the definite air of an epithet. I’ll be quite honest that I didn’t really know what a “Eurasianist” was apart from the fact I was somehow pretty sure I didn’t want to be one. In May, however, prompted by the publication by Arktos of two of his latest books, I decided to investigate Dugin and come to my own conclusions. The following essay is not intended as a comprehensive analysis of Dugin and the entirety of his thought (impossible given the duration of my study to date), but rather as a review of these two books and an honest “View from the Right” on the thought contained therein.

I don’t consider myself an overtly political thinker. I have an interest in politics, I have studied political history, and I understand the vast majority of the concepts and ideas involved. But I have very rarely occupied myself with the philosophy of politics, or with conceptualisations of what might constitute the “ideal” political situation. If anything, I have long considered myself a “political anti-Semite” in the same trajectory as the organised anti-Semitic leagues of late nineteenth-century Europe. In the belief of these organizations, politics remains fundamentally distorted and inorganic as long as certain social, cultural, and economic conditions, proceeding from wealthy Jewish lobbies and associated cultural activities, are permitted to prevail. Political anti-Semitism is thus concerned less with the philosophy and mechanics of politics, than with social criticism, the promotion of national-ethnic unity, and the achievement of a small number of very broad political objectives based on ethnocentric principles.

Dugin is a different thinker entirely. Although touching on social criticism, he is deeply fascinated, if not infatuated, with the minutiae, etymology, and genealogy of ‘the Political’ as both methodology and ideology. In *Political Platonism*, the more interesting of the two 2019 books by a considerable margin, Dugin offers a panegyric to the political philosophy of Plato and posits political Platonism as a panacea to the multifarious ills of modernity. What is political Platonism? Those familiar with Guillaume Durocher’s excellent *TOO* writings on the ancients will already have some idea. Whereas Durocher has usefully summarised Platonism as “practical inequality,” Dugin goes further semantically, offering political Platonism as a proxy descriptor for Fascism, or right-wing authoritarianism in general:

All opponents of democracy are instantly enlisted in the class of persons professing an ideology the very name of which has long since become a curse-word and an insult, and unscrupulous hypnotists use this technique more and more. Instead of this word, grown hateful and made senseless, which I do not even

wish to pronounce in this essay, it is better to call us “Platonists.” Yes, we are bearers of political Platonism. (PP, 20)

The volume is a diverse and intriguing collection of essays, lectures, and interviews that amount to Dugin’s exposition of political Platonism. Each brief chapter therefore differs in tone and approach, meaning that while Dugin’s writing style can sometimes tend towards the technical, the volume is a relatively rapid and easy read. I managed to read it over the course of two days, including the taking of notes and some background research. Did I enjoy the text and learn anything from it? Yes. Did I come away a convinced ‘political Platonist’? No, and I’ll explain why as we progress.

The first chapter, “The Philosophy of Politics,” is a transcript from a lecture of a course that Dugin gave at Moscow State University in 2014. This brief section of the book offers a good introduction to Dugin’s writing style (the lecture reads so well that one doubts it was ad-libbed), as well as to Dugin’s high praise of Plato (“Plato is the prince of philosophy”) and Carl Schmitt (“Schmitt is the political philosopher par excellence”). The basic theme of the chapter is that while true politics is always guided by a philosophy, modernity has introduced swathes of politicians who lack a philosophical dimension:

People who do not have the philosophy of politics, who do not have philosophy, they are as much politicians as computer programmers are. In fact, a person who does not know philosophy cannot engage in politics; he’s not a politician. He is a hired government worker who is simply in front of a wall. Someone has told him: go there, do that. What to do, where to go ... He might be an excellent user, but in reality politicians who lack a philosophical dimension are merely on a construction site, some foreign construction site. (PP, 4)

Following the first chapter is an essay offering a political Platonist “Deconstruction of Democracy.” I enjoyed the essay, and some of Dugin’s observations are magnificent and presented with flair. Democracy, he argues, is hardly a neutral concept. He sees democracy as

a form of secular cult or a tool of political dogmatics, thus, to be fully accepted into the West, it is necessary by default to be “for” democracy ... That is why in discussions about democracy we must say at once whether we are completely for or completely against it. I’ll respond with extreme candor: I’m against it, but I’m against it only because the West is for it. (PP, 11)

The West, in Dugin's worldview, is a hypocritical, corrupt, and declining giant. Its pretensions to extend freedom to the Middle East and beyond are laughably cynical: "No one can give us freedom. It either is or it is not. A slave will convert even freedom into slavery, or at least into swinishness, and a free person will never be a slave even in fetters." (PP, 12) Further, "democracy is not a self-evident concept. Democracy can be accepted or rejected, established or demolished. There were splendid societies without democracy and detestable ones with democracy, but there was also the opposite. Democracy is a human project, a construction, a plan, not fate." (PP, 12) The chapter closes with a detailed analysis of the attitudes of Aristotle to democracy, before Plato is invoked as the exemplary enemy of democracy:

Plato burned the books of Democritus. Democrats, and in particular, Soros's spiritual guru Popper, in his catechism *The Open Society and its Enemies*, call to burn the books of Plato ... For us, Platonists, democracy is a false doctrine, it is built on a world that doesn't exist and a society that cannot exist. (PP, 20-1)

In the third essay, "Political Platonism and Its Ontological Bases," Dugin digs deeper into the meaning of political Platonism, briefly summarizing its attitude to the cosmos, power, politics, and truth. Dugin defines it as "entirely contrary to the spirit of modernity and post-modernity."

By far the best essay of the volume is to be found in chapter four, "Traditionalism Against Devilopolis." The essay contains Dugin's reflections on the First Russian Congress of Traditionalists. It's an excellent piece of social criticism as well as a celebration of the tremendous growth of Traditionalism within Russian academia, politics, and wider society. He first sets the scene:

A hundred years ago a majority of people looked into the future with optimism, awaiting a transition to something better, in some sense guaranteed by the very logic of history. Today an entirely different mood prevails in societies: if it isn't directly apocalyptic, it is at least skeptical regarding the "unrestrained burst of humanity forward into progress and enlightenment." Although technical development continues at full speed, mechanisms are perfected, machines become "smarter," and means of communication improve their possibilities, this does not affect human happiness directly at all, does not guarantee any moral or spiritual heights, and does not increase justice in the social order. (PP, 32)

Rising from the ruins of stagnant modernity is a resurgent Traditionalism: "a philosophy, worldview, ideology, style." (PP, 33) Traditionalism arrived in Russia in the 1990s, when the first translations of René Guénon, Julius Evola, Marcea Eliade, and Titus Burckhardt were published. It was a further 20 years

before the first representative conference of traditionalists was held in October 2011. Dugin relates that the conference was not only successful, “but represents an original, living, and to a significant extent, reactive orientation, absorbing into its ranks many intellectual youths, students, graduate students, and scholars.” (PP, 33) Following a brief summary of the conference and its importance, Dugin goes on to situate the ideas of Guénon and Evola in his political Platonist critique of decadent modernity — the “Devilopolis” of the essay’s title.

Dugin asserts that “Tradition is integrity. Modernity is entropy, dispersion, and dissipation elevated into the rank of a value and actively spread everywhere.” (PP, 36) As modernity sinks ever deeper into depravity, Traditionalism rises in relevance. “The crisis of modern civilization, the inner contradiction of Western ideology, clearly obvious dual standards of international politics, and the moral crisis of technological society are evident.” (PP, 40) Adding to the extant contradictions, there exists no current mode of critique:

Formerly this function was served in part by Marxists criticism, which strictly criticised liberal capitalism, concealing even more painful contradictions, but in our time the ideational potential of Marxism as a critical theory has been exhausted. It lacks the correct means to describe the processes unfolding in the modern world, and it received a very difficult, or even fatal, blow in the collapse of the socialist system. As a result, critique from the left is becoming unpopular. The time of critique from the right is arriving. (PP, 40)

Dugin wants Russia to be at the forefront of this critique, and asserts that if Russia “wants to survive spiritually,” it must “stand under a different banner, under the banner of Tradition, radical conservatism, Orthodox faith in union with other traditional confessions, and, if you like, under the banner of Revolution against the post-modern world.” (PP, 46) Opposed to Russia is a Western Devilopolis, whose main features are “parody, simulacrum, and counterfeit.” It is a Devilopolis that indulges in “the reduction of things to money, and money to collections of numbers or to a barcode ... Our civilisation is built wholly and completely on money. It is the civilization of Mammon.” (PP, 45) Particularly honest is Dugin’s observation that Russia’s current rejection of some of the more flamboyant expressions of the Western Devilopolis (public celebration of sodomy and transgenderism) isn’t due to some unique Russian prescience but rather that

we are on the periphery of Devilopolis, not an alternative to it, but one of its remote provinces preserving, by inertia, some times with traditional society, not through our own will, resolve, or choice, but because the tendencies and directives from the “center” reach us with difficulty and haphazardly. (PP, 45)

Russia must choose its path quickly, because “ahead are a crisis and the quick end of the known order.” And, in the next essay, “Plato’s Relevance for Russia and the Platonic Minimum,” Dugin proposes mass education in the political philosophy of Plato. Those in power who are unfamiliar with his works “should be promptly removed from the state. Even traffic police must know Plato.” (PP, 48) The bulk of this brief essay can be condensed in its final sentence: “The project of a New Russia must begin with the Platonic announcement.” (PP, 51)

The two subsequent essays consist of bullet point theses. The first of these concern “Christianity and Neo-Platonism.” In this essay, Dugin argues that Platonism and Christianity are entirely compatible and complementary, since Platonism is “precisely the foundation of the conceptual apparatus of the entire Nicene dogmatics.” (PP, 53) The second of these “theses” essays concerns “Heraclitus and Contemporary Russia” or “Theses Towards the Modernization of Russian Society.” By “modernization,” Dugin does not mean technological progress, but rather an updating of the nation’s philosophical armoury. Dugin asserts that Western philosophy thrives on the concept of logos, whereas Russia has been philosophically mired in chaos. I have to confess that this particular essay lost me a bit due to the employment of some quasi-esoteric concepts and an increasingly abstract writing style. One senses that Dugin is taking his argument into some fascinating areas – one only wishes he did a better job of taking the reader along for the ride. As an example:

We must not go down the path of Icarus; we must return to the lowlands, along the path of Orpheus (it is possible that we must turn and look at what they did with Eurydice ...); return, but illuminated by light, pierced by fire, consumed by lightning. Only then will we be able to understand the secret dimension of Heraclitus the Dark: all is one – logos is chaos. Darkness is light. THERE is here. (PP, 61)

Right.

It is only in chapter 8, an interview on his book *Noomachy* (Wars of the Intellect), that we see the text’s first mention of Eurasianism, and it is here that my problems with Dugin really began, only for them to be clarified and compounded further by my subsequent reading of *Ethnosociology: The Foundations*. The heart of the issue lies in Dugin’s anti-Westernism, which is in some ways his great strength and yet which has undergone some rather dangerous mutations. Dugin is scathing of historical Western claims to primacy or supremacy, believing that Western culture is no better than any other. In fact, he asserts that “the basic idea of Eurasianism” is “the plurality of civilizations and the baselessness of the Western pretension to universalism.” (PP, 63) This form of hostility towards the West has led Dugin to adopt reprehensible allies and very sinister intellectual idols. He sees “the plural anthropology of Boas and

Levi-Strauss" as being in the same trajectory as Eurasianism (PP, 63), and describes Boas as "the outstanding ethnographer, philosopher, and anthropologist." (E:TF, 153)

In *Ethnosociology: The Foundations*, a highly technical book very different in tone and style from *Political Platonism*, Dugin attempts to divorce the concept of ethnicity from racial considerations, presumably as part of a broader scheme to overcome racial differences and create a new Eurasianist ethnicity (and thus, power bloc) spanning much of Eastern Europe and encompassing also some North Caucasian Turkic peoples and Balkars. In pursuit of this grand ambition, he has produced a text that is actually one of the most scathing attacks on racial thinking I've read in recent years.

The book starts with an overview of the development of Russian ethnosociology and an attempt to define ethnicity. It takes just thirteen short pages for Dugin to grapple with the position of race in such a definition. He asserts very quickly that "ethnosociology does not ascribe any substantial or semantic indication to physical resemblance," and remarks that even someone "altogether uncharacteristic for the main population of Eastern Slavic-Great Russians" should "undoubtedly" be considered "a member of the Russian ethnos" as long as he "considers himself Russian, speaks Russian, thinks in Russian, and is a co-participant in Russian culture." (E:TF, 14) As regards arguments that race should be considered the foundation of all studies of ethnicity, Dugin retorts:

The physiological, biological, zoological and anthropometric components of this society are not only not the cornerstone; they are not studied at all, since there are no reliable studies (besides racist nonsense) about their credible connection with social peculiarities. (E:TF, 15)

Related to the denial of race is condemnation of the idea that some civilizations are more developed than others. Dugin describes such approaches as "racist," "absolutely unscientific," and "inadmissible." (E:TF, 28) Citing Boas, Dugin asserts "the sole correct form of the classification of ethnos is their placement on the scale "simple — complex," with the admonition that "the concepts of simplicity and complexity should not carry anything at all positive or negative; these are two neutral constants, founded on the description of a phenomenon. There are simple societies and complex societies. Neither one is better or worse than the other. They are simply different." (E:TF, 28)

“There are simple societies and complex societies. Neither one is better or worse than the other. They are simply different.”

Dugin celebrates the fact

Boas achieved a real revolution in American Anthropology, wherein, prior to his arrival, evolutionary and Social Darwinist approaches dominated, and racial theories, which explained sociological particularities by innate, inherited markers and racial belonging, were popular, and an inflexible conviction in the absolute superiority of modern Western (European and American) society, its technology and values over the rest of the world, reigned. Boas built his scientific program on the denial of all three forms of racism: evolutionary, biological, and Eurocentric.” (E:TF, 154)

Dugin draws intellectual nourishment from the efforts of Boas, and has much praise for the “resplendent constellation of his students, among whom are gathered almost all the stars of American Ethnology, Anthropology, Linguistics and Psychology.” (E:TF, 156) He then offers glowing individual profiles on many of them, the majority being anti-White, anti-Western Jews.

Despite possessing such a corrupted ideological core, I persisted with, and finished reading, *Ethnosociology: The Foundations*. The lingering feeling I had afterwards was that of great disappointment and frustration, because there is much to praise elsewhere in the book, not least its condemnation of a modern Western culture that has eliminated even the most sanitized ethnic considerations from the realm of acceptable discourse. His observation that contemporary civil society “presupposes the absence of the ethnos” is entirely accurate, and his section on “Global Society as the Apotheosis of Civil Society” is nothing short of brilliant. There is, somewhere in this flawed text, a good book, but one that cannot escape the magnitude of its errors. If these are Dugin’s foundations of ethnosociology, then ethnosociology is doomed to collapse. The foundations are rotten.

Having read these two offerings from Dugin, I see his thought as a warning to all who might become overly focussed on philosophical issues, grand geopolitical schemes, and inter-European historical enmities. As I said at the outset, I don’t consider myself an overtly political thinker, nor am I a philosopher. My political objectives are simple, and their simplicity permits me to see dangerous diversions and distortions when they arise. One of the best sentences from *Ethnosociology: The Foundations* is “Society is capable of itself re-establishing its own integrity with reliance on itself and on the basis of its inner resources.” (E:TF, 19) Unintentionally, Dugin has enunciated a foundational premise of political anti-Semitism – the idea that once distorting outside influences are removed from the body

politic, politics and society will organically re-establish its own integrity. One wishes that Dugin would remove outside influences from his own work and thought, and re-establish his own integrity. That being said, both texts are recommended to those seeking novel and challenging reads, and who are equipped to separate the wheat from the chaff.

Dugin on the Subject of Politics

Giuliano Adriano Malvicini

An agent of chaos: Alexander Dugin with the chaos star, symbol of Eurasianism

Dugin's Social Constructionism

The claim that there is no biological basis for the concept of race, or that it is not useful in explaining contemporary reality, is of course patently false. But Dugin follows postmodern thinkers like Foucault and Althusser in arguing that not only race, but all political subjects are constructs.

Race is a product of society, rather than society a product of race. Man, he argues, exists as a subject only within the political realm. "What man is, is not derived from himself as an individual, but from politics. It is politics that defines the man. It is the political system that gives us our shape. Moreover, the political system has an intellectual and conceptual power, as well as transformative potential without limitations" (The Fourth Political Theory, p. 169). In other words, the subject does not create itself, nor is it a natural given like race or the individual. The subject is a construct, existing only within a political system.

It follows that ultimately, there is no master subject who creates or exercises conspiratorial control over the system. On the contrary: subjects exist only as functions, produced by subjectless political structures. As the political system changes, shifting from one historical paradigm to another — from traditional society to modern society, for example — it constructs the normative type of subjectivity it requires to function. "[T]he political concept of man is the concept of man as such, which is installed in us by the state or the political system. The political man is a particular means of correlating man with this state and political system. [...] We believe we are *causa sui*, generated within ourselves, and only then do we find ourselves within the sphere of politics. In fact, it is politics that constitutes us. [...] Man's anthropological structure shifts when one political system changes to another" (The Fourth Political Theory, p. 169). In other words, the subject does not bring about a political paradigm shift on its own — it is the new paradigm that will call a new subject into being through a process of "interpellation."

The study of the anthropological shift from the type of man belonging to traditional society to the type of man belonging to modern society leads to the relativization not only of modern man, but of modern rationality as such. This relativization of modernity is "postmodernity." The modern idea of progress towards a humanity unified on the foundation of universal Reason is shown to be an illusion, and this implies that traditional societies are placed on the same level as modern society.

Dugin's reasoning appears to be as follows: the subject cannot radically break through the system (carry out a revolution or "paradigm shift") and go beyond it if it is itself a product of the system, and can only exist within the limits of that system. This was why class, race, and the individual, all of which are subjects constituted and defined within the horizon of modernity, failed to overcome the crisis and impasses of modernity. In other words, the subject would have to be grounded in a reference point outside of the political system, in order to have the leverage needed for any radical political agency. There would have to be a "radical subject," and for Dugin the "radical subject" seems to be chaos. Chaos is freedom beyond its capture within the limits of the bourgeois or humanist conception of the individual. The shattering of the liberal individual is not the negation of freedom, but the revelation of the essence of freedom as anarchic, sovereign chaos, a chaos that will be mastered only through the emergence of a new kind of subject.

The political subject acts within the realm of politics, but must be founded in a realm beyond and before the political – in the case of modern, secular ideologies, the realm of nature. The subject of politics must transcend the sphere of politics in order to be able to master it, define it, and set its boundaries and goals. For example, liberal ideology posits the existence of the individual as a natural given, prior to the existence of the social order. Only in this way can it found the political order on the individual and its universal, natural rights.

Analogously, National Socialists view race as a biological given existing prior to and beyond the political, and the state as possessing meaning only insofar as it is an instrument through which a race is protected, preserved and its potentialities are actualized and enhanced. This means that for National Socialists, race transcends the political realm, subordinating it to itself. The political consciousness they strive to awaken others to is racial self-consciousness, much as Marxists attempt to awaken the proletariat to class consciousness.

For Marxists, the means of production transcend the political realm, forming its material basis and driving force. A class constitutes itself as a political subject by taking control of the means of production. Marx defined labor as "the metabolism of nature."

"The definition of a historical subject is the fundamental basis for political ideology in general, and defines its structure" (The Fourth Political Theory, p. 38). For example: for nationalists, the real subjects of history are nations, viewed as a sort of supra-individuals with a will and a destiny of their own. History is the history of nations. Identity is primarily national, and the friend/enemy distinction (which is constitutive for the political) goes along national lines. For racism, on the other hand, the true subjects

of history are the various races, locked in a Darwinian struggle for life. This view of history is determined by the modern concepts of biological evolution and progress. Identity is primarily racial, and the friend/enemy distinction goes along racial lines. For Marxism, the subjects of history are classes, again viewed as forms of collective subjectivity, and consequently, the whole of history was interpreted as the history of class struggle. Identity is class identity, and the friend/enemy distinction goes along class lines.

The political subject is also an historical subject. This means that each modern political ideology corresponds to a “grand narrative” — an over-arching interpretation — of history. History as a whole is viewed as created through the agency of a certain historical subject. It then becomes obvious that political ideologies are secular substitutes for a theological interpretation of history, and that the historical subjects posited by them are substitutes for divine Providence as the transcendent subject of history. As Carl Schmitt argued, all the fundamental concepts of politics are secularized theological concepts.

The place of the political subject — a kind of vacuum left by the withdrawal of God from the world and history — is the site of contestation between the various modern political ideologies. Each of them fought to occupy that vacant place with their own concept of the political subject. Each of them claimed to master the destructive and creative forces liberated by modernity, bringing modernity to its full actualization. Communism saw itself as the final, inevitable and culminating phase of modernity, towards which industrial capitalism had only paved the way. Liberalism views the progressive liberation of the individual, along with the processes of secularization, modernization, and globalization, as an historical necessity. Fascism saw itself as an avant-garde, revolutionary movement, dismissed liberal, bourgeois democracy as a doomed residue of the nineteenth century, and claimed that the organic state was the only adequate form through which the masses could be mobilized in modern societies. Both Italian Fascism and German National Socialism modernized and revolutionized their respective nations, and would not have been politically successful if they had not done so. Early Fascism was influenced by the avant-garde modernism of Futurism, which called for the nihilistic destruction of the past and unconditionally worshipped modern technology and “progress.” (This led Evola to reject Futurism as a form of “Americanism.” Marinetti retorted that he had as little in common with Evola as with “an Eskimo.” Bizarrely — for someone who claims to be a traditionalist — Dugin views Futurism as one of the admirable elements of early Fascism that he wishes to recuperate.)

Each of these political systems, then, claimed that it was the most appropriate form for modern, technologically advanced society. This form corresponded to a certain figure or human type, an embodiment of a certain political project, the normative “man of the future”: be it *Homo sovieticus*, the new Fascist man, the racially purified Aryan superman, or the enlightened bourgeois individual. In other words, each of these ideologies or “political theories” posited a normative subject as the basis of its

political vision and its interpretation of history. The transition into fully realized modernity was not only a political revolution, but also an anthropological revolution: the production of a “new man.”

According to Dugin, in the crisis of the end of modernity, not only race and class, but also the nation-state ceases to be an authentic political subject, even though he recognizes that the will to preserve national sovereignty is, in the current situation, a natural locus of resistance to globalism. The de-sovereignization of the nation is its de-subjectivization. After 1945, European nations ceased to be sovereign, independent historical actors, and effectively also ceased to exist as historical subjects with a real identity.

However, Dugin sees this de-sovereignization/de-subjectivization as inevitable, even inherent in the nature of the nation itself. He fully accepts the postmodern idea that the nation is an artificial, ideological, and political construct, an “imagined community” created as a means of unifying fragmented, modern societies. The nation is, in his view, merely a simulacrum, an artificial substitute for the lost totality of traditional society (presumably, he views race similarly, as being a modern simulacrum of the “ethnos”). Historically, its emergence corresponds to the precise moment when traditional society enters into crisis. It is a compromise, a transitional form, a ruse.

Moreover, he views the function of the nation as a device for facilitating the transition from pre-modern, traditional society to fully modern, liberal, civil society. As a result, it cannot constitute an enduring force of resistance to liberal globalization. He views the nation as a dispositive of power geared to producing a certain standardized, normative type of political subject: the bourgeois individual (citizen). In doing so, it destroys regional, organic, ethnic communities (for example, through the suppression of regional autonomy, traditions, and linguistic variation in Italy and France, and the imposition of a standardized national language) as well as liquidating the last residues of traditional elites (the aristocracy).

Thus, the concept of “ethno-nationalism” is, in his view, ultimately an absolute contradiction in terms: the nation is inherently “ethnocidal.” It destroys the ethnos and replaces it with a “demos.” Nationalism, according to Dugin, must be condemned not just because it has been the cause of pointless, destructive wars, but because the nation itself is inherently violent — violent in the sense that it is an arbitrary construct without any sacred, transcendent basis. Its violence is the violence of modernity itself. (Certainly, this is true of many nations, perhaps most notably of the nation of Israel, which is an entirely modern, artificial construction, as is perhaps the idea that Jews are a unified, homogeneous race or ethnic group.) Nothing, however, so far assures us that the idea of Eurasian empire dominated by Russia would be less artificial, violent or “ethnocidal.”

(The new European post-war order projected by the dominant faction of the Waffen SS was not based on the nation-state, but on a pan-European federation of culturally autonomous regions. Dugin fails to mention this fact, but his characterization of National Socialism is tendentious.)

In any case, the ultimate incompatibility of Eurasianism with ethno-nationalism is clear. David Beetschen of the Eurasianist artists' association has given poetic expression to this incompatibility in the following (stirring!) lyrical effusion:

Have you dreamt of the eurasian parliament
for which all energy we have joyfully spent.
There isn't any discriminatory segregation
in class, race, sex or in any form of a nation.

As for the fascist concept the organic state, based on Hegel's philosophy of the state, Dugin does not discuss his reasons for rejecting it as a credible candidate for the political subject. In general, Dugin simply takes the defeat of both the second and third political theories as axiomatic, without providing much in the way of substantial argument for this. The third political theory simply does not exist after 1945. "Each and every declared fascist after 1945 is a simulacrum" (The Fourth Political Theory, p. 174). In his view, modernity has been fully actualized in liberal society, and consequently, the ideological contest of modernity is over.

This view is more credible with regard to communism than with regard to fascism. The death of communism was, as Dominique Venner has written, an "inglorious demise." Its collapse was due to its own bureaucratic inertia and utter failure to effectively manage economic development. Fascism and National Socialism, on the other hand, were spectacularly successful as political experiments, and, perhaps for this very reason, had to be militarily destroyed by their international rivals.

Dugin clearly views the defeat of National Socialist Germany as a consequence of its anti-Russian and anti-communist policies. Since Dugin views both of these policies as connected with the infection of National Socialism by Atlanticism and Anglo-Saxon, biological racism, he views the defeat of the third position as a consequence of ideological errors, and not simply as an historical contingency. Not only was Nazi Nordicism a vulgar, materialist misinterpretation of the traditional doctrine of the north as the

pole of tradition, National Socialism was anti-communist and anti-Slavic because it was anti-Eastern, that is, pro-Western (modern).

Today, according to Eurasianists (who in this respect are inheritors of National Bolshevism), European nationalists are repeating the disastrous errors of the German National Socialists when they again oppose “the East” in the form of Islamisation. Generally, Eurasianists try to downplay the idea of a “clash of civilizations” or any claim that there is a sharp opposition between Islam and European civilization. They accuse nationalists who view Islam as incompatible with European values of confusing “Europe” with “the West.”

Any interpretation of European history that sees some enlightenment values as rooted in the European tradition itself — in classical Greece, for example — is accused of trying to legitimate “the West” by inventing historical precedents and falsifying the true European tradition, which is rooted in Eurasia and in no way opposed to Islam. This is undoubtedly consistent with a Traditionalist position, which only recognizes those elements of European civilization as valid that are derived from the unitary, universal Tradition, of which Islam is viewed as a part. However, the exclusivist claims of Islam, especially in its modern, radical form, are wholly non-Traditional.

Dugin sees the triumph of liberalism as a necessary, fatal triumph, in a sense. Liberalism has triumphed because it can legitimately lay claim to being the most successful actualization of the potentialities of modernity. Liberalism did indeed succeed in modernizing the West to a much greater degree than communism succeeded in modernizing the countries of the Eastern bloc, so much so that “the West,” and particularly the United States, is today more or less synonymous with modernity. In the decades after the second world war, capitalism, using economic means, modernized Western European societies to a degree undreamed of by fascism, making the third position ideologies seem archaic and obsolete by comparison. In a sense, liberalism is the origin of the other ideologies of modernity – both communism and fascism emerged as attempts to overcome liberalism, while mastering the forces liberated by modern industrial capitalism and technology. It has also outlived the adversaries it engendered.

Dugin Contra Nationalism

Why does Dugin reject nationalism? His negative view of nationalism differs to some extent from that of Evola, who saw it not only as destructive of the traditional European order, but also as leading towards modern collectivism (Dugin, on the contrary, sees collectivism as something positive). Does Dugin follow Heidegger in viewing nationalism as an “anthropologism” (cf. “Letter on Humanism”)? What Heidegger

mean by this is that nationalism, like Marxism, places man, rather than Being, at the center of history. Nationalism is a "subjectivism," in the sense that it views man as the subject of history. In this sense, nationalism is indeed a modern phenomenon, since modernity, for Heidegger, is essentially an epoch in the history of metaphysics that was initiated with Descartes' cogito: with the rational subject as the secure foundation of philosophy and science. Descartes identifies the subject with reason (ratio). This became the metaphysical foundation for the Enlightenment and its anthropology.

However, Dugin does not, unlike Heidegger, reject subjectivism as such. On the contrary, the whole point of the fourth political theory is that it is the search for a new "political subject," an alternative to the individual as a political subject.

Why does Dugin give Heidegger's concept of "Dasein" the pivotal role in the "fourth political theory"? Heidegger elaborated his analysis of Dasein as an attempt to overcome the abstractions of the metaphysical concept of the subject. Hence, his "analytic of Dasein" offers the possibility of going beyond the modern political ideologies based on various interpretations of the subject. Dasein is beyond, or prior to, the subject-object split. Dasein is not the rational subject as the abstract basis of the concept of universal man. Dasein is the historical, spatio-temporal structure of concrete existence. The subject is outside of the world, relating to the world as a system of objects. Dasein is always already in the world, involved in it, struggling within it. The world, as Heidegger uses the term, is a totality of relations of meaning. Each thing refers to other things in a circuit of relations. Dasein's relation to things is one of understanding and interpretation, not (primarily) one of objectification.

The subject is reason, that is, it is defined by its relation to an ultimate cause and foundation (Grund). Dasein is defined by its relation to finitude, death, and the abyss (Ab-grund). However, all this means that it is not clear how Dasein, which according to Heidegger is precisely not the subject, can be called "the subject" of the fourth political theory. Dasein is not a subject that arbitrarily imposes its will, creates itself from nothing or freely makes history. Instead, it is part of a cosmic process that transcends man and his agency. Man does not decide the history of Being. Heidegger is not interested in re-elaborating or modifying the concept of the subject, nor is he interested in returning man to "God and Tradition" in the sense of metaphysical foundations, but is trying to overcome metaphysics itself, that is, all thinking in terms of the Being of beings as a "foundation" (Grund). This also means that Heidegger is far from the metaphysical conceptions of Traditionalism.

If Dugin invokes Heidegger and the analytic of Dasein, we must assume that behind the critique of liberalism and the West, he is attempting a critique of modernity as such (identified with the West). Heidegger's critique of modernity is linked to an attempt to overcome the philosophy of the subject. In

Heidegger's view, modernity, when the humanitarian masks of the Enlightenment fall off, is technological nihilism, and this nihilism is the fatal consequence of Western metaphysics. Western metaphysics, however, is the foundation of Western civilization as a whole.

Heidegger's critique is not simply political. He is criticizing Bolshevism, liberalism (which paved the way for Bolshevism), and other modern ideologies for failing to understand not only their own essence, but the essence of modernity itself: technological nihilism. According to Heidegger, the emancipation of the subject (humanity interpreted as subject) is not the purpose of technological development. It is the other way around — the emancipation of the subject is a means through which technology emancipates itself. Here, Heidegger's interpretation of modern technology draws on Nietzsche's concept of the will to power. According to Nietzsche, the self is not the subject of the will to power, but is brought into being by the will to power. The last glimmers of transcendence are extinguished from the world so that technology can pursue, unobstructed and on a planetary scale, the endless, circular self-enhancement of its productive power, drawing everything into its vortex, with no ultimate goal or end other than power for its own sake. The West becomes "das Abendland," the evening-land, the realm of the darkening of the divine, the withdrawal of the gods. Technology as "Ge-stell" is not mastered by man (the subject), but an impersonal destiny of Being itself. Man as a subject can never master technology, since the essence of technology as Gestell constitutes man as a subject. Technological development has no intrinsic, immanent limit, and no boundary can be arbitrarily set to it as long as thinking remains within the horizon of the philosophy of the subject (humanism) and of technological calculation (the final deviation of the Western logos). But as modern technology reaches the full actualization of its dominion, the subject that it once called into being enters into crisis, begins to "vanish." It is liquidated in a system of purely functional relations without a center, without fixed norms or foundations. The essence of the subject reveals itself to be a kind of limit, which initially functioned as a necessary ground or condition, but now becomes only an obstacle to be overcome. For Heidegger, this crisis, this ultimate threshold of nihilism — brought about by technology itself — opens up the possibility of thinking the essence of man and Being in a much deeper dimension, beyond or before the subject. Instead of man as subject, Heidegger tries to think the historicity of Dasein. This is why the "inner truth" of National Socialism for him meant the confrontation between modern technology and historical man (that is, not man as subject).

For Heidegger, Western modernity and materialism are not, as traditionalists claim, the consequence of a fall from the normal, traditional society of medieval Europe. On the contrary, he views the transition from the Middle Ages to the modern age more as a development than as a radical break with the traditional past. For Heidegger, medieval scholasticism, with its misinterpretation of the Greek logos as "ratio" and its onto-theological synthesis of Greek philosophy with Christianity, prepared the way for Descartes' rationalism. In a sense, Heidegger develops Nietzsche's idea that nihilism is not so much a break with Christianity, but instead a revelation of the nihilistic essence of Christianity. As a Christian and a traditionalist, however, Dugin consistently avoids the anti-Christian aspect of Heidegger's thought,

without, however, being able to articulate a critique of it. For Heidegger, as for the majority of the conservative revolutionaries, the origin of modernity is Christian, or rather, it lies in the “onto-theological” synthesis of Christianity and Greek metaphysics. It is the Christian conception of the “sovereignty” of God with regard to the world as creation that is at the origin of the modern concept of the subject, just as the Christian notion of the free individual with a personal relation to God and the Christian concern with the salvation of the immortal soul of all individuals is the origin of modern mass individualism. It is God as the “highest being” — both *causa sui* and *causa prima*, the first cause, sovereign over all other beings and the “maker” of the world — that is at the origin of the sovereign subject whose relation to things is one of instrumental manipulation and objectification. Modern secular humanism is onto-theological: it has its origin not in Greek thought, but in the Christian interpretation of Greek thought.

We may add that the Evola of *Revolt Against the Modern World* also sees Christianity as a primary cause of the involution of the West. He does not view modernity as a fatality somehow inherent in the nature of the West. For Evola, the Western mode of spirituality, which is primarily an active rather than contemplative spirituality, was cut off from the dimension of transcendence by the Semitic, lunar, self-mortifying type of religiosity of Christianity, which ultimately lead to the Western drive to activity being deviated, finding an outlet only on a purely material and human plane.

In any case, whether from a Heideggerian or Traditionalist view, one may agree that race, insofar as it is conceived as a purely human, biological characteristic, is ultimately insufficient, or rather, that it is too narrowly anthropological, and must be integrated into a deeper conception. This is not the same as liquidating the concept of race. It does mean the rejection of certain narrow forms of racism, where the biological concept of race plays an analogous reductive role to the Marxist concept of a material base that determines the ideological superstructure (culture, mentality, etc.) of a society.

Man is not the unconditioned, self-creating subject of modern metaphysics. Human existence is conditioned and finite — men are, as Jünger wrote, “sons of the earth.” Race is one of the earthly conditions of man’s existence. An historical world is not an unconditioned, arbitrary “construct.” There is, in Heidegger’s terms, an historical world is always founded through a struggle between world and earth — the world, an articulated, historical space of possibilities and decisions, and the conditions set by the un-objectified, elemental forces of the earth. Blood and soil are given the meaning of a destiny in an historical world (this is not at all the same as claiming that it is an arbitrary historical and social construct). For Heidegger, the limits set by the biological potentialities of human beings are not arbitrary historical creations — what is historical is the particular “figure” or constellation of relations that gives them meaning.

We can also note that the statistical concept of race referred to by race realists today is very different from National Socialist racial theories, which were based on the idea of racial purity. The modern concept of race is not on its own sufficient to non-reductively account for the specificity of our or other civilizations or cultures. The differences between the mentality of Americans of European descent, on the one hand, and the mentality of Europeans, on the other, underscores this clearly. However, it is more than obvious that race plays a role in shaping the general character of civilizations.

POLITICS

Duginism Update: Alt-Right goes full Eurasianist, full Third Worldist, full Bolshevist, and full r*t*rd — Irrefutable proof of trickery.

Date: May 18, 2020

Author: thuletide

23 Comments

EDIT 2022: If you don't want to read 8,000 words, then please read this much shorter article, which covers most of the same information and includes a two-minute-long TL;DR explanation. However, this longer article does contain some extra information that you may find useful.

8000 words (sorry).

Contents:

1. Introduction
2. My general thoughts on the situation
3. Relevant Background Info on Dugin
4. The Alt-Right x Dugin Connection
5. Alt-Right Proselytization Strategy 2020
6. "Racist Liberalism"
7. It's All Irony, Bro
8. Third Worldism
9. Anti-Racism (Edit 05/23/2020)
10. Rehabilitation of Marxism, Bolshevism, Communism

11. Spergouts, Shitstorms, Meltdowns

12. Conclusion

13. Final Note

1. Introduction

I wasn't going to write about this topic anymore because, frankly, I'm bored of it, and everyone else is bored of it too. I want to return to writing helpful things* but I keep getting dragged back into this shitshow in various ways. That's probably because I was the guy who originally pointed out the Alt-Right's increasingly deranged nonsense to a lot of people and explained 'Duginism,' so I guess I don't have any right to complain. It's not that I think that this stuff is completely useless to talk about, it's just that I would rather spend my time working on the many, many, vastly more useful projects that I could be working on.

Unfortunately, this article is a long one. As this is my final word on this matter, I don't want to leave anything to ambiguity.

* I promise the anti-pornography articles are coming soon. They're hard to write because I get too mad when working on them.

To be honest, I think I've already sufficiently made my point via Twitter, evident by the fact that other influential nationalists have noticed the same bizarre trends and are in agreement that something r*t*rded and fishy is going on.

In this article, I'll summarize and expand upon my arguments, in addition to presenting a mass of supporting evidence. Thank you to all of the people who sent me quotes, Tweets, information, etc. I wouldn't have been able to compile all of this without your help. And, for any Alt-Righters reading this: No, there was no organized "gayop" here, people just started randomly sending me all of this stuff, so I saved it.

2. My general thoughts on the situation

My overall argument is that over the past few years, the Alt-Right has devolved into a bizarre cult of hot-takes and mindless e-celeb worship, filled with disingenuous and obtuse pseudo-intellectuals who seem to care more about feeling big-brained on the internet than they do about White people. This “culture” appears to have been propagated by a few leading e-tellectuals with very shady personal connections.

Many people are tired of this vapid “intellectualism” and pompous fart-sniffing. Not because intellectualism as a whole is evil or unnecessary, but because the hot takes drummed up by these e-tellectuals are consistently atrocious, and becoming progressively more terrible as time drags on. They frequently go beyond the point of mere stupidity and into the realm of being actively harmful to our cause. Nobody seems to be questioning this consistent idiocy and ineptitude. Why? Are they scared of “big names”? Scared of losing “clout”? Scared of losing a few followers? Scared of “dividing da moobment”? Who knows.

Many people on the Alt-Right (but by no means all) appear to be driven by an egotistical desire to superficially LARP as the most “radical dissident” possible, attempting to “out-radical” all other “dissidents” on the internet. This quest for novelty and obscurity is not exclusive to nationalism, but a widespread and widely studied sickness of our “extremely-online” era. The porn addict’s endless quest for increasingly depraved and perverse fetishes is perhaps the most renowned example of this phenomenon.

William Luther Pierce has talked about this type of character at length: “They are defective people, either they are people who simply can’t function successfully in society, that they are losers or anti-social misfits looking for company, or they are escapists or adventurers, who don’t really want to serve our cause but are looking for some politically incorrect diversions; some politically incorrect self-gratification.”

[You can find the full clip on YouTube: “William Pierce Speech, Jul 20, 2007”].

Since the dawn of the “migrant crisis” in Europe, the accelerated rates of foreign invasion into the US, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and the total collapse of South Africa, public inclination toward “our ideas” (aka the truth) has increased dramatically.

The rising nationalistic sentiment among the public is a natural response to the rapid destabilization of our civilizations and societies. This shift is evident in the ever-growing support for so-called ‘populist’ parties. Most nationalists know that these parties are completely fake and g*y. They are fielded by the System as a way to re-absorb would-be political dissidents and re-direct them towards the System’s goals and agendas. See, for example, the European populist parties, whose main talking point is to decry Islam due to its “regressive and bigoted” attitudes towards thots and the Rainbow Coalition. However, controlled opposition does not invalidate the genuine increase in nationalistic sentiment among the masses (or patriotic sentiment, at least).

[See also: ‘The System’s Neatest Trick’ by Ted Kaczynski]

While public receptiveness to our baseline principles has increased exponentially over the last half-decade, the ideas and outward appearance of the Alt-Right have become evermore deranged, alien, and all-round repulsive to all normal people.

I’m not arguing that nationalists are going to win a massive public ballot-box victory. I believe that’s functionally impossible due to the basic nature of humanity: The majority of the population (80-90%) are, by nature, “NPCs” (normies) who will, generally speaking, follow the dominant culture propagated by the leaders of society, as long as that culture and those leaders continue to satisfy their basic material needs (shelter, food, safety, etc.). Theoretically, there is absolutely nothing wrong with that behavior. Within human society, there is an inalienable biological caste system, created by the natural force of the Cosmic Order. Our societies would rapidly disintegrate without the normies who keep the gears of civilization moving; they are as much an integral part of the natural social hierarchy as the elite, intellectuals, aristocracy, and so on. The problem is that the normies have been weaponized against our own people, programmed to destroy themselves and their own civilizations.

What I’m arguing here is that we still need to appeal to the remaining 10% of society, the “free thinkers.” We aren’t going to do that with any of the deranged trash that the Alt-Right has been peddling for years, which culminated in the shit pile that is their 2020 rhetoric. They appear to have almost completely abandoned the very simple core principles of nationalism, that should, theoretically, resonate with all Whites who are not “too far gone,” so to speak.

There should be nothing “controversial” or fundamentally repulsive (to the non-brainwashed) about any of the following stances:

Pro-:

Family

Health

Religion

Beauty

Nature

Hierarchy

Order

Tribalism

Racialism

Freedom [1]

etc.

Anti-:

Globalism

Wage-slavery

Corporate dominance

Materialism [2]

Degeneracy

etc.

In fact, much of the public is begging for people who politically represent many, if not all of these points. The widespread public support for figures such as Trump, Salvini, Farage, and Orban proves this to be the case. Again, these men are all frauds who have signed allegiance to the New World Order. However, again, that does not invalidate the genuine sentiment and desire for a return to “normality” among the masses.

The masses are sick of their meaningless lives and social isolation; they are tired of the terrorism, murders, rape, and pedophilic grooming gangs; they're scared that their daughters will become wh*res and their sons will become “daughters;” they have no more tolerance for the wretched Communists who tell them that they were born “privileged,” while their friends and family die of drug overdoses; they have no more respect for the globalist political elite and Liberal bourgeoisie, who have forced all of this poison onto their once safe and stable societies.

Rather than capitalizing upon all of this, the Alt-Right has instead turned to aggressively promoting Third Worldism, constantly shilling for hostile foreign nations (specifically Eurasia and the Middle East, most of which is equally as “NWO” occupied as the West), while promoting virulent anti-“Westernism,” and attempting to rehabilitate Marxism and Bolshevism.

They do all of this under the guise of “de-ligitimizng” ‘Neo-Liberal Globalism’ and the ‘American’ World Order.

If we are to assume that all of their kook antics are genuine beliefs — non-astroturfed, non-glowing, and non-subversive — then to call these people completely brain-dead would be the understatement of the millennia. If I wanted to completely destroy a rising nationalist movement and have it fade into schizophrenic irrelevancy, I wouldn't do anything differently to what the TRS/Spencer faction of the Alt-Right is currently doing and has done for the past few years.

[1] One of the greatest swindles of the New World Order was to trick people into believing that “freedom” is equatable to one's ability to become a slave to base biological impulses; to become addicted to and dependent upon drugs, alcohol, pornography, and so on. If you think that “freedom” is somehow a negative value then you should read Mein Kampf. See how much Mr. “Anti-Freedom Nazi Guy” Hitler talked about the values of freedom and liberty.

[2] Not in the philosophical sense but the normie “being materialistic” sense, although I am opposed to philosophical materialism, it’s not really a normal-person-friendly selling point.

“Alt-Right 2020 strategy meeting”:

3. Relevant Background Info on Duginism

This article is, in a way, an addendum to my other long article about Dugin. If you don’t want to read that article (it is very long, but I recommend that you do), the TL;DR is as follows:

Dugin is probably a fed (foreign intelligence agent), working for GRU or SVR.

Dugin claims that National Bolshevism is the closest ideology to his Neo-Eurasianist vision of the future.

He regards himself and his ideology as a continuation of the work of the original Bolsheviks.

Dugin was a leader of the Russian National Bolshevik Party (which was founded by a homosexual male prostitute called Eduard Limonov).

Dugin subverts nations around the world into supporting his Neo-Eurasianist agenda.

Dugin’s subversion transcends ideological boundaries.

Dugin changes his rhetoric based on his audience, so he can market his Neo-Eurasianism nonsense to as many people as possible.

His book ‘Fourth Political Theory’ is an example of this ‘targeted marketing’ being used on White nationalists in the West.

There is copious evidence of leading Alt-Right and Identitarian figures openly endorsing Dugin, being endorsed by Dugin, or espousing his rhetoric verbatim.

The Alt-Right's rhetoric in 2020 is basically copy-pasted from Dugin's 'Foundations of Geopolitics' and 'Fourth Political Theory.'

Alt-Right leaders deny this to be the case, even though we have the receipts of them being directly associated with Dugin on first-degree terms.

Note that I am not arguing that all Alt-Righters are "Duginists," but that Dugin's theories and rhetoric have been widely disseminated throughout the right-wing, by a select few influential and subversive figures (e.g., Richard Spencer). Consider the way that Western Marxism ("Cultural Marxism") was disseminated throughout the Anglosphere by only a handful of influential and well-connected figures, and then spread further via cultural osmosis.

Dugin sans-beard.

The basic TL;DR of Foundation of Geopolitics is as follows:

1. Utilizing racial minorities (but also racists) to cause disruption and chaos within "Atlanticist" territories.
2. Isolation of the Anglosphere (or the "Atlanticists") from the rest of the European world.
3. Promoting pro-Russian and pro-Eurasian attitudes in the West, while also promoting virulent anti-Western attitudes (blaming the NWO entirely on the West and Atlantic "Liberalism").
4. The merging of various (mostly European) countries to create larger geopolitical blocs (superstates).
5. The necessity of a Russo-Islamist alliance.
6. Promoting anti-"Atlanticist" Third Worldism.
7. Absorption of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe into Russia itself.
8. The creation of a "Third Rome."
9. The creation of a "Multipolar" world.

Almost all of these agendas feature prominently in Alt-Right rhetoric, especially as of 2020.

Defining 'Duginism':

Duginism is, in short, Neo-Eurasianist Third Worldism.

When you strip back Dugin's many layers of psychobabble, his ideology is simply a revival of Bolshevism and the USSR; Russian imperialism, merged with later Western Marxist theories on [the deconstruction of] race and gender, and so on. He combines all of that with "the planet must unite in the hatred of Whites" style Third Worldism, which he poorly disguises as "anti-Liberalism." You could say that Duginism is 'Bolshevism 2.0.'

Duginism is crypto-Communism in the same way that Western Marxism is crypto-Communism. It has all of the qualities of Communism, all of the objectives of Communism, yet it does not label itself Communism.

If you don't believe that somebody would lie about literally all of their beliefs for the explicit purpose of destroying someone else's movement/organization/etc., then look into the Sabbateans and Frankists, both of whom Dugin has praised glowingly. The former LARPed as Muslims and the latter as Catholics, infiltrating both religions to subvert them from within with weird Kabbalistic occultism. The Frankist 'Conversos' were the cause of the Spanish Inquisition, which was focused on removing 'heretical elements' (aka Frankists) from the Catholic church. For a more modern example, consider the "ex"-Trotskyite 'Neo-Conservatives,' who move to the US from the USSR, immediately dropped the Communist label and started LARPing as "Conservatives," while continuing to promote Trotskyist ideas. This is by no means a new phenomenon.

Dugin's exoteric message of creating a "multi-polar world" is basically identical to the ideas of Kalergi, the United Nations, and every other ultra-globalist NWO-peon in history: A planet divided into a few major "superstate" regions. As per the NWO plan, these superstate regions will eventually be merged into one overt World Government, rather than the covert World Government that we live under today. The apparatus for total world governance is already in place via the United Nations' various networks, which were collaboratively founded by Western Liberals and Eastern Communists (aka Freemasons and Our Greatest Allies) before the Second World War had even ended. The UN was founded in 1942, and World Bank and IMF in 1944.

My personal theory is that “Duginism” is a geopolitical strategy to move the NWO’s base of power (military, economic) out of the United States (the West in general) and into Eurasia. Soon shit will hit the fan in the West, I’m sure the overlords won’t be hanging around when it does; they’re not going to go down with the ship, so to speak. Once the US has been bled dry and collapses, the NWO gang will no longer be able to use it as their global military enforcer. By moving their base of power to the East, Russia and China can take the place of the US and become the NWO’s primary military golems. Therefore, Dugin’s esoteric objective is more closely related to the vision laid out by Ben-Gurion, ex-prime minister of Isr*el: Total world governance led by Isr*el and enforced by an extended Eurasian USSR. I’m currently writing something that will explain all of this messianic mumbo-jumbo that Dugin loves, which will be my final say on Dugin himself.

Dugin is a huge fan of occultism. He’s lauded Chaos Magic, Aleister Crowley, Freemasonry, and called the Kabbalah the “greatest achievement of the human spirit.” The logo he chose for his Neo-Eurasianist movement is the chaos star, which is also found on Aleister Crowley’s Tarot deck.

Finally, and most importantly (as far as we should be concerned), Dugin is wholesale anti-White. Many of Dugin’s writings echo Kalergi’s statement on turning Europe into a Eurasian-African hybrid race.

It’s pretty obvious that we’re not dealing with a guy who can in any conceivable way be considered “good” or “on our side.” Dugin is, quite literally, a satanic globalist.

All of this information has been available online since the 90s, and Dugin continues to publish anti-White tirades to this day. This fact makes the “pro-White” Alt-Right’s undeniable connections to and endorsement of Dugin all the more perplexing and inexcusable.

Edit (05/23/2020):

The below quote is from Dugin’s 1998 ‘Either Us, Or Nothing.’ As you’ll see, the only major change to his rhetoric through the decades is that he developed some nuance and realized that telling people to “submit or die” wasn’t a very smart way to achieve his goals:

National-Bolshevism does not mean the pragmatic ways of Bolsheviks and European Nationalists, conditioned by Realpolitik. Nor does it mean the identical aspects of both “projects”. It is something deeper that could appear only after the fall of the historical incarnation of one of the ideologies – the Soviet Union.

These are the basic elements of this [ideology]:

1. Eschatological awareness, clear understanding of the fact that the civilization is finally nearing its end. This leads us to the idea of eschatological restoration. [By this he means Messianic end-of-the-world shit].
2. The idea of inadequacy of the existing religious institutions of eschatological goals – The spirit of reformation or “new spirituality” (mysticism, Gnosticism, paganism). [By “paganism” he presumably means Satanism or some sort of New Age c*ncer].
3. Interest for the East and dislike for the West. Geopolitical orientation towards Eurasia.
4. The principle of “new aristocracy”, rising from the masses of the people.

5. Radical denial of [...] exploitation. Effort to bring all peoples to the state of the “golden age”.

National-Bolshevism is by far the most interesting phenomenon of the 20th century. The sole alternative for the modern world, this empire of the “liberal” antichrist, is NATIONAL-BOLSHEVISM. Either it, or nothing. No compromise will change anything.

(I'M NOT SURE WHY HE'S TALKING ABOUT THE 'ANTICHRIST' WHEN HE'S BEEN A SATANIST FOR DECADES.

4. The Alt-Right x Dugin Connection

The images below contain evidence of influential Alt-Right and 'Identitarian' figures either openly promoting Dugin, being promoted by Dugin, having first-degree connections to Dugin, or regurgitating his theories verbatim.

There is far more evidence available than I have included in this article, but this selection should be enough to demonstrate that the 'Alt-Right x Dugin' connection is very real, and that their denial of this connection is deceptive.

Arktos is the company that founded Richard Spencer's Alt-Right dot com website:

Dugin has strong links to the French New Right, who he essentially described as his greatest allies in Europe, stating that the French New Right, particularly Alain de Benoist, is implementing his own Fourth Political Theory. De Benoist has, in turn, spoken glowingly of his old friend Dugin on many, many occasions; he even named his own book after Dugin's 'Fourth Political Theory.'

Spencer has been promoting Dugin since at least 2012.

Arktos' Dugin translator:

Note: I'm not calling all of the above characters "Duginists", this image merely demonstrates that Dugin is not the obscure and non-influential character that the Alt-Right claims him to be — "Dugin is just a meme" according to Eric Striker.

My disclaimer on "ideological osmosis" is below; read it before you sperg out and claim that I'm calling every man and his mother a Duginist.

"Dugin doesn't real" – Man who is good friends with two prominent Duginists, and who podcasts with Eric Striker, an organizer from Heimbach's now-defunct Duginist political organization, Trad Workers Party.

(Heimbach is now an anti-hate, globalist, multiracialist, anti-White "deradicalization expert").

Somebody sent me the Facebook page of Zero Schizo's podcast. Contains lots of Bolshevism and promotion of weird Satanic stuff. Note the Duginist "Eurasian" symbol (chaos star). I guess he only LARPs as a Fascist when he shills to White audiences (he's a South American brown person).

Duginism is all in your mind, my fellow "fashy goy."

5. Alt-Right Proselytization Strategy 2020

For months, or perhaps years in some cases, the Alt-Right has had free reign to pump trash into the minds of nationalists in the West with little to no pushback. This is largely due to their monopoly on nationalist media, which was greatly assisted by the Alt-Right being shilled by the mainstream media. Throughout 2020, these people have done nothing but stir up trouble for nationalism, re-directing it into ineffectual or even downright harmful avenues.

Since the beginning of the "Coronavirus" situation, they have promoted insanely divisive rhetoric, claiming that any nationalist who does not...

... like Z*G overreach is a "Libertarian"

... love China is a "Neo-Con"

... love Russia is a "Cold War hawk"

... rehabilitate Marxism is a "Liberal"

... support Palestine is "Z*onist"

... ally with people who hate us is a "traitor"

The Alt-Right's proselytizing strategy in 2020 is basically as follows:

"If you don't support this fringe geopolitical strategy that I only adopted a week ago, then you're an enemy of the white race, even though there's zero evidence that my strategy will help the white race at all, if it were to succeed."

Once again, I recommend that you read (or at least familiarize yourself with) Dugin's Foundations of Geopolitics and Fourth Political Theory, and compare his rhetoric to theirs. If anyone has any other ideas as to why the Alt-Right are promoting this weird stuff — all of which coincidentally aligns perfectly with Dugin's Neo-Eurasianist agendas — then please let me know.

Now that people are pushing back against the Alt-Right's brazenly obvious subversion and constant aggression towards other nationalists, they are crying out that they are the victims of "gayops." Some Alt-Righters claim that there is some sort of organized internet campaign to call them stupid, funded by Peter Thiel (? lol). Apparently, the idea that people would naturally be repulsed by their weird shilling, without any meddling influence from capitalist billionaires, is beyond the pale to these people.

These unhinged characters have the audacity to call all of their detractors "schizos." It's incredible.

"Do people call us Duginists because we shill for China, Russia, Islam, Third Worldism, and Marxism? No, it's because we don't worship Drumpf!" — Weird Alt-Right guy who relentlessly shills for Communist China, 2020

In the cult of the Alt-Right, those who can conjure up the most obtuse, novel, or repellent 'hot takes' rise to the top. Those who disagree with the hot takes, or question the integrity of the cult leaders, are "Literally Hitler." Or whatever the Alt-Right equivalent would be. Literally Thiel? Literally CIA? Literally J*wish?

6. "Racist Liberalism"

The term "Racist Liberal" is the latest in the lineage of Alt-Right buzzword-smears as mentioned in the previous section. They appear to have settled on "racist liberal" as their smear of choice. This is not insignificant. Dugin uses the term "Liberal" interchangeably with "Western" (and also "White/European"), in addition to frequently using the term "Racist" as both a pejorative and a synonym for "Liberalism."

In the Duginist worldview, the global dichotomic conflict is:

"NWO" (= USA = Atlanticism = West = "Liberalism" = Racism = Europeans)

versus

The rest of the planet (brownpip, being led by Russia)

This is a standard Marxist 'Oppressor vs Oppressed' dichotomy:

– Proletariat versus Bourgeoisie (Orthodox Marxism)

– LBGT Brown Coalition versus Straight White Patriarchy (Western Marxism)

and so on.

Don't take my word for it, take Dugin's and take the Alt-Right's:

If you come from a Communist background, as I do*, you should also know that "Liberal" is the default Commie slur for fellow Communists who "aren't being Communist enough." It's their version of "cuck." Like Dugin, they also operate on the axis of "everything I don't like is Liberalism," often claiming that Fascism is a form of Liberalism — "Fascism is capitalism [Liberalism] in decay."

* I was a Tankie once, everybody makes mistakes.

Ironically, it was Nick Fuentes who first started using the term “racist liberal” to describe the Alt-Right. Although, Fuentes was seemingly using it in the American “Liberal = Leftist” sense. Racist Leftists is probably a more accurate descriptor, though Leftism and Liberalism are all strains of the same progressivist genus.

See this video, approximately 2 minutes in:

I wonder why Fuentes did that?

A real mystery.

(Even Spencer’s own girlfriend called him a libt*rd):

7. It’s all Irony Bro

After myself and many others pointed out the Alt-Right’s weird Duginist-esque Third Worldism and Eurasianist shilling — “All races must unite against the evil ‘Liberal American’ World Order!” and so on — many Alt-Righters decided to drop the mask and become full-blown “ironic” Duginists.

They’ve essentially become ‘Irony Bros 2.0’; except instead of being funny, they’ve opted to be as repulsive as possible. At least the real Irony Bros use irony to escape persecution by the System, these

ret*rds only use “irony” as a way to deflect criticism from other nationalists who ask them why they’re shilling all of this weird, subversive shit that nobody likes.

Has anyone ever believed the “it’s just irony, bro, I’m kidding, it’s all jokes :^)” excuse anyway? I thought we were all pretty familiar with the fact that “irony” is simply used to mask genuine beliefs that we can’t openly espouse due to extreme social repercussions? Well, whatever, here’s a selection of their “just jokes bro”:

(I don’t think Enoch is a “Duginist” per se, but I do think that he is a liar):

Eric Striker’s “ironic” Strasserism:

Was it all “irony” when they were relentlessly shilling for China, which initially caused this shitstorm?

“China dindu nuffin, Xi is a good boi” – Striker

All of these people are full of shit. They've been promoting all of this crap un-ironically for months, or even years, in some cases. Now that they have been caught with their pants down and everyone is calling them subversive ret*ards, they're desperately trying to deflect criticism in any way they can.

In one breath they'll tell you that Dugin (and NazBol) has no influence and is "just a meme," and in the next they'll tell you that they are Dugin aficionados and that you should read his work.

(You should read Dugin's work, if only to understand the current state of subversion in the West. I've linked all of his relevant essays in the article I wrote on him).

"Just kidding:"

FYI: Francis Parker Yockey is an Alt-Right favorite. He started as a relatively normal nationalist, but devolved into ridiculousness after coming to the false conclusion that Stalin had "Purged Communism of J*ws." He spent his later years advocating for a Eurasian alliance between Europe and the USSR, and an alliance between nationalists and Communists around the world. He also promoted Third Worldism. He was one of the most prominent advocates of the "red-brown alliance" malarkey favored by the Alt-Right's hot take crew. Yockey was an incredibly intelligent man, but that doesn't mean that he was right.

Below: No White Guilt calls out 'novelty takes' (by this he means all of this weird shilling that the TRS-Spencerite crowd have been doing) as harmful, egoistic attention-seeking that lures people away from the very clear and obvious path to victory, and misdirects them into ineffectual or downright harmful avenues.

Predictably, his replies were full of butthurt Third Worldists, Eurasia shills, open Duginists, and literal feminists.

Note the Third World flags:

Do these people sound like they're "just kidding" to you? For people who are "just kidding" they seem to get pretty mad when you tell them that all of their "jokes" are bad.

8. Third Worldism

For the past few weeks, Alt-Righters have been relentlessly shilling for Islam (Palestine, Arab states, Iran, etc.), as well as promoting Third Worldism, in general. Again, this is one of Dugin's main agendas.

Prominent Alt-Righters have constructed an insane false dilemma, whereby anyone who either doesn't care about Palestine, or doesn't actively support Palestinians is, somehow, "pro-Z*onist." People who say "I like neither Palestine nor Isr*el" are also pro-Z*onist, according to the Alt-Right.

The guy below was another member of the Traditionalist Workers Party (reminder: it was a Eurasianist organization founded by totally-not-a-fed Matthew Heimbach).

How exactly is Palestine more important than what is currently happening in our own countries, to our own people?

More to the point, how exactly do these people plan to “support” Palestinians? Send them money? Accept them as refugees? Perhaps they’ll join Hezbollah and “take the fight to the enemy!” or something? Maybe they’ll ally with the anti-colonialist Western Leftoids who are anti-Israel because they view it as a “White supremacist state” and because “taking land by force is immoral; who also want Whites to move back to Europe and pay reparations to Africans and American Indians?

Nope.

They’re just going to put a little flag in their twitter bio and call everyone who disagrees with them a “Zionist Jewish supremacist shill,” a “fed,” a “racist liberal” or whatever buzzword they’re using this week.

While on the subject of “racist liberalism,” the Alt-Right smearing all of their detractors as “racist liberals” is perhaps the most ridiculous display of brazen hypocritical chutzpah I’ve ever seen. Their entire argumentation for why Whites should support Palestine (and Third Worldism in general) is based almost entirely upon Liberal Humanism.

Their virtue-signaling “muh poor oppressed brown people” arguments and their attempts to shame nationalists into “supporting” and “allying with” foreign ethnic and racial groups (who overwhelmingly despise us) are no different to the White Guilt tactics employed by the anti-White far-left.

Supporting Palestinians because “muh illegitimate state” or “muh illegal settlements” is not only Liberal Humanist cuckoldry, it also completely undermines our own territorial claims. How do these geniuses think that Whites conquered North America, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa?

What happened to “we won’t apologize” and “human rights aren’t real”?

An ethnic group has as much “right” to a territory as it can defend or take said territory by force, and no more.

Crying that Isr*el is an “illegitimate state” simply opens us up to anti-colonialist attacks from anti-Whites. More importantly, it re-opens the Pandora’s Box of White Guilt, that whites have collectively fought to close since the end of WW2. Worse still, it weaponizes White Guilt against the very people who should be fighting it.

Matt “Cuckbox” Parrot of the “totally-not-Duginist” Trad Workers Party:

The problem with Isr*el is not that “X brown desert people are very mean to Y brown desert people,” but that it actively harms our own people, through its dominance over Western politics, its draining of our resources (financial, military, technological) for its own expansionist aims, its financing of refugee movements into our countries, and so on.

By all means, we should point out their hypocrisy with regards to the “muh human rights” rhetoric that they employ in the West, but the Alt-Right’s leftist underdog fetishism and slave moralism is the worst combination of Liberal Humanist sentimentality and Marxist Third Worldist anti-colonialism.

Lo and behold, exactly as I had warned: The “based” brown nationalists who have been taken under the wing of the Alt-Right immediately attempted to manipulate Whites into supporting their desert turf wars, by labeling those of us who don’t care about their petty land squabbles as “J*wish supremacists.”

‘Taking our own side’ is necessary because ‘White Guilt x White Extortion’ is the dominant global paradigm. All non-Whites are completely aware of this, and will always use it to their advantage and to manipulate us — even “based nationalist” non-Whites.

Endorsed by TRS, of course:

Adorning your social media profile with a multitude of Third World flags is also a common Marxist-Leninist trope. Totally unrelated, of course.

According to Keith Woods, 'taking our own side' is akin to sociopathy, and is the behavior of anti-social freaks and Neo-Nazi caricatures — which is ironic, considering his close associates include the Traditionalist Workers Party, 'The Daily Shoah', and so on.

The Alt-Right to Liberal Humanist pipeline is real.

Keith Woods; anti-Christian, pro-Islam:

Below: Woods shilling Alain Soral via a video in which Soral praises the victory of the "Islamic East" (Russia) over the West, calling it a "sign of hope." Soral is an anti-racist, Eurasianist, multi-racialist, who wrote the introduction to the French edition of Dugin's Fourth Political Theory.

Mike Enoch and Eric Striker have both downplayed the impact of Islam upon White countries, in addition to downplaying the historic conflicts between the Middle-Easterners/North-Africans and Europeans. They, and many other Alt-Righters, have claimed that Muslims are actually our “natural allies” against the System.

Here’s the alliance that doesn’t exist anywhere other than college campuses:

Below is territorial loss from the previous Islamic invasion into Europe, that Striker and Enoch downplayed as “some clashes in Spain or whatever” and “some stuff from the Middle Ages” via their podcast on Islam, which is overflowing with similar Hot Takes™. “That was 500 years ago!” Striker proclaimed, as if that somehow makes this on-going clash of civilizations irrelevant. It’s also an appeal to the Myth of Progress — more Liberalism.

The insane historical revisionism of Striker and Enoch has, unfortunately, mindfucked their audience, who regurgitate all of their bullshit verbatim.

Apparently, these people are completely unaware of things such as the Barbary Slave Trade (1500 – 1800 AD), during which millions of Europeans were enslaved by North Africans and Ottomans (aka the Barbary States) — even after Europeans paid them millions of dollars in ‘tribute’ (extortion money), in exchange for being left alone. This slave trade only ended when various European nations (French, British, Dutch, and American) united and collectively waged war on the Barbary States, resulting in the colonization of North Africa in the 1800s. The entire United States Navy was established to combat the Barbary States.

Acting as if this is all some distant past, and that the Middle Eastern and North African people are now our greatest allies against the “Liberal” World Order, is schizophrenic levels of delusion. They left us alone for 200 years because Europeans came together and united to absolutely own them, then colonized them and subjugated them to stop them screwing with us.

Below: Striker, who I’m told has a history degree, merges two different men, who were alive at completely different times, in an attempt to make a nonsensical and a-historical “one struggle” argument.

Without getting into the history in too much detail, and discarding Striker’s historic illiteracy, the Persian Muslims allied with Charlemagne to gain power over Arab Muslims and take territory from the Christian Byzantines. Hence, Charlemagne was a traitor to the Christian world and the Abbasidians to the Muslim world.

The history doesn’t particularly matter too much, since his argument is just “bro, not all X are like that.”

Edit, 6/14/20:

Below we see the direct results of the TRS/NPI/Radix crowd opening the doors of their “White nationalist” movement to non-Whites. Only a complete cretin could not have predicted that this would happen. Was this their intention all along?

More nonsense from Striker:

Our natural allies:

3 days of news in Sweden:

Keith Woods endorsing Gaddafi:

Gaddafi gloating about Islam conquering Europe without having to fire a single bullet:

Every single post like this on the internet is filled with similar comments from our natural allies:

Every time one of my immigration-related posts goes semi-viral it gets filled with comments like this:

Remember their reactions to Notre Dame? ([More here](#)).

Apparently, people raping your kids en masse is more of a reason to support them as an ethnic group. How many levels of racial cuckoldry are TRS promoting?

This occurred as I was writing this article:

Advising nationalists to not only behave sympathetically towards openly hostile out-groups, but to ally with them politically, displays a grotesque misunderstanding of nationalism and identity on the most fundamental, baseline level. Almost all White countries are, regrettably, on the verge of racialized civil war (we already see this occurring in South Africa). What sort of mindset does the Alt-Right's rhetoric instill in the Whites who have been thrust into this situation against their will? Weak, cucked, submissive, apologetic. I don't believe that these people are stupid enough to simply "misunderstand" nationalism in this way. This is treasonous subversion, pure and simple.

Reminder:

9. Anti-Racism (Edit 05/23/2020)

Richard Spencer's pet, Keith Woods, implies that the root cause of this conflict is that people are opposed to "forbidden ideas" and the reading of "forbidden books."

Yep. The problem is definitely that some people are reading books. Obviously, it has nothing to do with the fact that these people continuously attack, deconstruct, or even wish destruction upon their own in-group, while constantly praising and felling hostile out-groups, as documented in the previous section.

If you removed the names on the Tweets below, it would be impossible to tell if they were written by people who are “on our side,” as they claim to be, or a member of ANTIFA or any other hostile, anti-White group. Additionally, all of these Tweets sound like they were copied directly from Dugin’s anti-White writings.

Ask yourself: would you ever see Black nationalists, Arab nationalists, J*wish nationalists, etc., saying the following things about their own people?

“The White working class deserve to die, the White race is not worth saving.”

“White civilization / Europe is not worth saving”

“White does not exist” — ‘Deconstructing whiteness’?

“We are not nationalists, we are not right-wing”

“Traitor” is a strong word, but how else could you describe this? What is more traitorous than decrying your in-group while allying with out-groups that openly state that they wish to destroy your in-group? How does this differ in any way from anti-White libt*rds and globalists?

Once again, I’m not claiming that all of these people are feds, or plants, or infiltrators, but that they have been heavily influenced by toxic subversion that has gone unchallenged for a long, long time. This is a sickness.

10. Rehabilitation of Marxism, Bolshevism, Communism

Alt-Righters constantly defend Bolshevism, Stalin, the USSR, Third World Marxist states, and Marxism in general. They deny the Holodomor, claim that Cultural Marxism doesn’t exist, claim that Stalin was a “based anti-NWO, anti-s*mite,” and claim that Bolshevism is somehow reconcilable with the diametrically opposed worldview of Nationalism. They attempt to pass all of this off as “ironic shitposting,” even though they have been shilling this malarkey long before they became cheap, imitation Irony Bros. Their fundamental aim appears to be the eventual rehabilitation and absolution of Communism, and the re-framing of the New World Order as a creation of pure “Liberalism.” Again, this precisely mirrors the rhetoric and objectives of Dugin.

Cultural Marxism denial:

(Modern “art” was overwhelmingly produced by “ex” Communists)

You may think you have Hot Takes™ but you’ll never have a take as hot as:

“The Western Marxists were actually trying to save civilization, not destroy it.”

Thank you “Commie Nazi,” very cool!

The idea that Western (“Cultural”) Marxism is “un-influential fringe stuff” is some of the most insane revisionism that I’ve ever seen. Western Marxism is a widely popular academic field, having been taught at every single college and university in the West for the past few decades. The Marxist thinkers responsible for developing these theories, the highly influential Frankfurt School, had links to the United Nations, Rockefellers, and so on. Some of their students even authored the UN’s racial statements, which helped spread race-denialism and “hate speech” laws throughout the West. Around 50% of the Frankfurt School’s leading figures were CIA and KGB agents. All of the founding theorists of Western Marxism were once Orthodox Marxists. Antonio Gramsci, who invented the “colonize the Superstructure” political strategy (aka the ‘Long March Through The Institutions’), is probably one of the most important political thinkers of our age. He was the first influential Marxist figure to realize that Marx’ theory of “Base” over “Superstructure” was inapplicable to Western civilization, flipping Marxism from a centralized economics-focused ideology to a decentralized culture-focused ideology, defining the political battlefield of this century. Our society is currently so saturated with Western Marxist ideology that even “Conservatives” and “right-wingers” regurgitate the theories of the Frankfurt School on a daily

basis. Every major globalist elite and organization (e.g. Council on Foreign Relations, Bilderberg Group, etc.) utilizes the sociopolitical theories that were developed by Western Marxists.

Why would supposedly “well-read” people who should “know better,” such as Alt-Right e-celebs, deny all of this incredibly well-documented history? Because they are sloppily attempting to rehabilitate Marxism while blaming the downfall of the West entirely on Liberalism.

For more info see:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_Marxism (<http://archive.vn/2kTZz>)

<https://thuletide.wordpress.com/2020/03/20/the-history-of-cultural-marxism/>

Holodomor denial

Author for Richard Spencer’s Alt-Right website, apparently a personal friend of influential Alt-Right figures:

Fake quotes / lying about history

I have seen a lot more examples than this but, unfortunately, I didn’t save many (97% of the quotes in this article were sent to me by other people).

These people constantly claim that the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact was equivalent to an ideological agreement, rather than a non-aggression pact to avoid war between two rival and openly hostile powers, that were both expanding into the same territorial regions — Two powers that both planned to betray one another as soon as possible.

The Alt-Right often peddles the myth that Stalin “purged all of the J*ws from power” in the USSR. This simply isn’t true, at all, by any measure. After the Second World War, as soon as Stalin started causing trouble for some J*ws in the USSR, they almost immediately assassinated him via poisoning. Read more about this turn of events via the ‘Doctors Plot’ Wiki.

The TL;DR is that Stalin was mad at a small selection of J*ws because they were being “bad” nationalistic J*ws, and not “good” deracinated J*ws of the rootless ‘Soviet Man’ archetype. He didn’t hate all J*ws, and he certainly didn’t purge them all from power either. He had some Z*onist J*ws executed for promoting nationalism inside the deracinated multi-racialist Soviet empire and for generally being troublesome. Millions of other people, from a variety of ethnicities, were been executed for the same reasons. They were not executed simply because they were J*wish.

In Stalin’s own words, anti-s*mitism was punishable via the death penalty in the USSR:

Extracts from Goebbels’ book ‘Der Nazi-Soz,’ released in 1926, a few months after the date of the (supposed) quote above.

Apparently, this Ahab guy used to write for Richard Spencer's NPI. Weird how all of this shit seems to link back to Spencer, isn't it?

USSR rehabilitation and 'Red-Brown Alliance'

The Alt-Right's historical revisionism appears largely to be focused on fabricating evidence to prove the validity of their "Red-Brown Alliance" bullshit.

At no point in history has "Red" sided with "Brown," beyond extreme outliers and highly transitory, circumstantial alliances. The two worldviews of Nationalism (or National Socialism and Fascism) and Communism are diametrically opposed to one another on the most basic, fundamental level, and cannot, by any means, coexist or cooperate.

This fact is corroborated by the most well-known literature published by Bolsheviks and National Socialists alike.

The quotations below demonstrate the irreconcilability of these two worldviews. They are tiny selection from a near-infinite number of quotes that express identical sentiments.

- Marx and Engels, Communist Manifesto <http://archive.vn/UtFPO>

"The working men have no country. [...] National differences are daily more and more vanishing. [...] The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading civilised countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat"

- Lenin, Cultural-National Autonomy <http://archive.vn/HNzk6#selection-669.1-669.452>

“Marxism is irreconcilable with nationalism. Marxism puts forward internationalism to replace all forms of nationalism, the fusion of all nations into a highest unity.”

- Lenin, National Culture <http://archive.vn/HNzk6#selection-559.1-559.404>

“he who does not fight against all forms of national oppression or inequality, is not a Marxist [but] a petty bourgeois nationalist”

- Trotsky, What Is National Socialism? <http://archive.vn/VEcep>

“On the plane of politics, racism is a vapid and bombastic variety of chauvinism in alliance with phrenology.”

- Stalin, Conversation Between I.V. Stalin’s And Romanian Leader <http://archive.vn/qhoef>

“racism leads to fascism.”

- Stalin, Marxism And The National Question <http://archive.vn/f60d9>

“A nation is primarily a community, a definite community of people. This community is not racial, nor is it tribal [...] but a historically constituted community of people. The only cure for this is organization on the basis of internationalism. To unite locally the workers of all nationalities of Russia into single, integral collective bodies, to unite these collective bodies into a single party – such is the task.”

- Description of the New Soviet Man (Wiki) <http://archive.vn/GCcBl>

“He also has lost any nationalist sentiments, being Soviet rather than Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, or any of the many other nationalities found in the USSR.”

- Hitler, Mein Kampf

“Marxism’s ultimate goal is and always will be the destruction of all non-J*wish national

states. [...] Bolshevism represents the J*w’s twentieth century attempt to gain world domination just as they tried by different, though closely related means throughout history [...] Today, Germany is the next

great objective of Bolshevism. We will need all the strength of a young missionary idea to again rescue our nation from the entanglement of the international serpent “

- Hitler, Mein Kampf

“How can the German worker come to understand that Bolshevism is a damnable crime against humanity when we choose as our allies the very organizations of this evil plan and acknowledge it as an equal? [...] How can we condemn a member of the broad masses for his sympathy toward a world philosophy when the leaders of the State choose the representatives of that World-Concept as an ally? The struggle against the J*wish effort to convert the world to Bolshevism requires that we clarify our attitude toward Russia. After all, we cannot drive out Satan by using Beelzebub.”

- Goebbels, Communism With The Mask Off

“Bolshevism is not merely anti-bourgeois; it is against human civilization itself. In its final consequences it signifies the destruction of all the commercial, social, political, and cultural achievements of Western Europe, in favor of a deracinated and nomadic international cabal which has found its representation in J*daism. This grandiose attempt to overthrow the civilized world is so much more dangerous in its effects because the Communist International, which is a past master in the art of misrepresentation, has been able to find its protectors and pioneers among a great part of these intellectual circles in Europe whose physical and spiritual destruction must be the first result of a Bolshevik world revolution. Bolshevism, which is in reality an attack on the world of the spirit, pretends to be intellectual itself. Where circumstances demand, it comes as a wolf in sheep’s clothing. But underneath the false mask which it here and there assumes there are always the satanic forces of world destruction.”

Furthermore, the NazBol factions of Weimar Germany were banned from both National Socialist and Communist Parties. Lenin personally ridiculed the NazBols as “absurd,” and Hitler called the Strasserist (‘NazBol’) wing of the NSDAP “Salon Bolsheviks” and “crass Marxists,” in addition to having them killed, imprisoned, and exiled.

However, all of this won’t stop the totally-not-Duginist/NazBol Alt-Right from endlessly shilling Red-Brown Alliance bullshit...

^ Key word: Former Leftists. Hitler had the Left wing of the NSDAP killed en masse.

Endorsed by Spencer's co-host, of course:

"I didn't say National Socialist I said Nationalist Socialist :^)"

(Below): Keith Woods endorsed George Galloway as an example of a "good leftist."

After conducting some research on Galloway, I discovered that he's a very standard philo-s*mitic, rabidly anti-white Communist. He even assisted Communists in overthrowing Apartheid in South Africa by acting as, in his words, "an underground agent of the [Communist] ANC." This Communist revolution led to the total destruction of South Africa and the genocide of over 70,000 whites in a mere 20 years.

Rehabilitation of Marx(ism)

“Workers of the world unite!” – Karl Marx, free-market conservative:

“Just kidding, bro, stop doing a gayop.”

When these people tell us that they are Communists, we should believe them.

Translation; “I won’t call myself a Marxist because it’s bad optics” :

Reminder that Richard Spencer called the Alt-Right a form of Fourth Political Theory, which was personally endorsed by Dugin:

Almost all of these people claim to be “National Socialists” and “Fascists.” Remember those Sabbateans and Frankists and Trotskyite Neo-Cons, who all lied about all of their beliefs in order to infiltrate and subvert enemy movements from within? Really makes you think, doesn’t it?

11. Spergouts, Shitstorms, Meltdowns

I won’t include many, but below are a few examples of butthurt spergouts.

Eric Striker called me ‘COINTELPRO’ (CIA) because I quoted his buddies’ own words at him:

Glenn Beck also did a presentation on George Soros, so by Striker’s logic, Soros dindu nuffin now.

Striker also tried to call me a “capitalist agent provocateur” (whatever that means) by quoting Linkola’s anti-capitalist sentiments, which I also quoted in my 2019 “Intro to Pentti Linkola” article (you should read that, it’s quite short).

Also, apparently, the fully-clothed smiling anime wizard girl standing in front of a sunset in my Twitter profile pic is “cartoon kiddy porn.”

So, according to Striker, I’m a ‘p*dophilic capitalist shill CIA agent provocateur.’ Maybe he has a dysfunctional amygdala that caused him to go loco with ‘cute aggression’ when he saw my profile picture?

Mike Enoch had a pretty funny spregout on Twitter after I pointed out that while Our Greatest Allies certainly assist in mass migration, and are almost entirely responsible for open borders, the immigrants that move into White countries do so of their own accord. Nobody holds a gun to their head and forces them to migrate (they do tempt them to migrate by offering lots of free welfare and infrastructure, of course).

Apparently, this is incorrigible and I’m some sort of Z*onist federal agent, or whatever.

Any criticism of TRS is automatically regarded by them to be “bad faith.” Thou must not critique the cult.

Here’s Mr. Peinovich arguing with me in “good faith”:

Here's Peinovich's co-host and fellow boomer, Seventh Son, arguing in good faith, by calling everyone who disagrees with him a "bought opposition J*wish federal agent." Astounding.

Snapshot of my Twitter mentions after asking why TRS & Co promote Third Worldism and Eurasianism. Very sane, normal, and not cult-like behavior:

I am engaging in the high-level federal agent activity of asking why the fuck these people are promoting all of this weird shit.

On a podcast with Keith Woods, Richard Spencer said that he would never disavow Dugin, and that Dugin was a fascinating character, whose work he recommends.

"I'm not a Duginist, I just regurgitate all of Dugin's theories almost verbatim, published his book, think that he's a fascinating guy, called my own ideology 'a kind of Fourth Political Theory,' and refuse to denounce him, even though he's an anti-white globalist."

"I'm not a Stalinist, but I won't denounce Stalin in any way, in fact, I recommend you read Stalin's works and become more like him. P.S. I'm not a Stalinist."

Seems legit.

The most important thing to note here is that while I can quote all of these assholes and directly compare their rhetoric to subversives like Dugin, none of these ret*ards have done anything other than sperg out and call me a “J*wish z*onist p*dophilic capitalist agent provocateur racist liberal CIA fed.”

That doesn’t exactly scream ‘innocence’ to me. In fact, that sounds like very, very guilty people lashing out in a manic and desperate way. Kind of reminds me of when Elon Musk called out the press.

12. Conclusion

Well, there’s some of the evidence. To be honest, there’s so much evidence that it’s impossible to include all of it. Some of these statements and connections may seem permissible when read alone, but when presented in the wider context highlighted in this article, it becomes pretty obvious that major subversion is afoot. I think that it’s pretty safe to conclude that the Alt-Right is a subversive, toxic force, filled with liars, egomaniacs, and probably a few feds thrown in for good measure.

I won’t accuse all of them of glowing though (except for Dugin, who is definitely a fed), since it is entirely possible for someone to be ideologically moronic without being a fed. However, when people fuck up this frequently and this consistently, you should really start questioning their intentions and integrity.

Again, I advise that you familiarize yourself with Dugin’s exoteric geopolitical strategies and theories, and then compare it to the Alt-Right’s messaging. It’s pretty similar. Almost identical. I don’t necessarily think that Dugin’s esoteric kook satanism and anti-White stuff pertains to the Alt-Right, but Augustus Invictus was their official lawyer, and he is an Aleister Crowley loving Satanist who was in the Ordo Templi Orientis. So... You know... No fire without smoke.

And, again, I’m not saying that every single Alt-Righter is a conscious, self-identified “Duginist,” and I’m not saying that everyone quoted in this article is a self-identified Duginist either. But I am saying that Dugin’s ideas are clearly highly influential among nationalists in the West (whether they know it or not), and that the Alt-Right is one of the main vessels responsible for spreading this poison.

One final thing to consider: If influential “nationalist” figures, all of a sudden, began to promote, LGBT stuff, Z*onism, or a “Z*onist x Pro-White Alliance,” and so on, people would immediately understand that trickery was afoot. So, why does this not apply to Duginist rhetoric? Why does it not apply to the Marxism, Eurasianism, and Third Worldism shilling?

My theory is that because Duginist ideology has slowly and covertly colonized Western nationalism over the past few decades (via Richard Spencer & Co., the French New Right, and so on), we have now reached a level of Duginist saturation and ideological hegemony whereby people now assume that Duginism is what nationalism is all about. Let’s be honest here, most nationalists simply aren’t well versed enough in history or politics to understand that all of this is subversive. That’s mostly no fault of their own, since the people that they look to as educators fill their minds with total poop on an almost daily basis, as documented throughout this article.

What’s next in store for the insane asylum known as the “Alt-Right”? I don’t see how it can get much worse from this point, but I’m sure they’ll find a way to fuck everything up even more dramatically than they have done in 2020 so far and for the past few years.

Is this how we win?

It’s all so tiresome.

13. Final note

I appreciate that so many people sent me information and quotes over the past few months, which did enable me to write this article, but I don’t need to know every subversive word uttered by every subversive huckster. I politely request that you please stop sending me these things, tagging me in posts, and so on. Not because this isn’t an important issue to call attention to, but because I’ve already used more than enough of my valuable time attempting to explain this c*ncer. And one final thing: while you should call this stuff out, at least know what you’re talking about before you do it.

Anyway, that’s it. I’ve made my argument. I rest my case. I wash my hands of this subversive idiocy.

Enjoy these Evola quotes as a palate cleanser:

Encounter with Heidegger: An Invitation to Journey

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Thinking and its Authorities

Martin Heidegger is to the highest extent a fundamental author. He belongs among those figures in the history of thought that are unavoidable. Many things can be omitted, considered optional, perused at leisure. But there is something that demands careful and thorough study. Without such study our notions [представления; notions, views, concepts, ideas; this term will be considered explicitly and in detail below; until then, it is usually translated as notions] about thinking, philosophy, [and] the history of culture will be defective, incomplete, fragmentary, and hence unreliable.

Heidegger is indispensable for anyone who lives in today's world, in today's Russia, and tries at least somehow to ground the fact of his availability [наличия], presence [присутствия]. More often than not, of course, we do not have to speak of presence: after all, "presence" etymologically means "to be nearby the essence" [быть при сущи; the word "суть" will later take on a special meaning; until the author effects that change explicitly, it will be translated as "essence"], but who now is "nearby the essence"? But maybe we can at least ponder over availability? Even he who raises a question about his availability but slightly cannot bypass Heidegger.

It is impossible to think, and in particular to think about one's availability, about oneself, about the world, about life and death, without relying on one or another school of thought. If we do not ourselves know which philosophical system lies at the basis of our thinking, that does not mean that there is no such system. There surely is one: after all, our thoughts and notions are drawn from somewhere. If we attend carefully to the content of our own consciousness, take an approximate inventory of it, we can notice that one thing in it is from Plato, another from Aristotle, a third is consonant with Descartes' teaching, a fourth with Hegel's dialectic; some thoughts are taken from the arsenal of theology, some from Marxism; in some things the influence of Kant is apparent, and somewhere a fragment of Nietzscheism shines. The fact that philosophy does not reach us directly, not immediately, but through hundreds of half-anonymous echoes - in school, family, society, media, education, everyday conversations and disjointed consumer culture - changes nothing.

It seems to us that we ourselves think, but such an illusion arises only from ignorance or a poor education. We need only begin to work on ourselves for it to become clear that we constantly quote, and more often than not those sources whose existence we do not surmise. For precisely that reason, any person who wishes to think honestly will begin with a determination of the authorities and reference-systems of thought in philosophy, science, art.

A thinking person is always somewhat a philosopher. A philosopher always belongs to some school of thought: either he follows religious philosophy, or he is a Kantian, or a Hegelian, or a liberal, or a Marxist, or a Freudian, or a positivist, or a Nietzschean, or a structuralist, or a supporter of the "philosophy of life", or a solipsist, or an existentialist, or a materialist, or a Darwinist, etc. In very rare instances, a philosopher is capable of carrying out an interesting and original synthesis of different schools; and even more rarely, with gaps in the centuries, those thinkers appear who blaze new trails and actually open new horizons for the rest of humanity. These are great people, who mark the milestones of the thinking of all humanity; and it remembers them for centuries and honours them.

He who understands the great [thinkers] and takes one of the possible philosophical positions secures for himself the status of a philosopher, a full-fledged thinking entity (существо). And here is the most important honesty: one must in the first place bow before an authority (even if also with a "secret thought" of later overthrowing him) and think about oneself and the world in the inner hall of great ideas and theories. Those, too, who strive for originality at once and at any cost are not kept long in philosophy; their place is the market.

Heidegger: Great or the Greatest?

Among great thinkers, two places can be set aside for Heidegger, depending on how we look at him, to what degree we study him and how much we believe him.

At a minimum, Heidegger is the greatest contemporary thinker, entering into the constellation of Europe's best thinkers from the pre-Socratics to our time. In this sense they call him the "prince of the philosophers". Even those whom his philosophy leaves indifferent or who disagree with it recognize his indisputable greatness.

Heidegger is universally recognized as a great philosopher of world history. No one seriously contests this, but someone calmly passes by, relying on other trends in philosophy, while someone

responds keenly to his message, using his terms ("Dasein", "existential", "Angst", etc.) and allowing himself to be carried away by his thoughts.

A different, special, exclusive place in the history of philosophy that can be set aside for Heidegger should be recognized in the case that we fully trust Heidegger, immerse ourselves in his thinking, and make him our highest authority. In other words, Heidegger in the space of Heideggerianism will differ essentially from Heidegger in the average and conventional history of philosophy. In this case, Heidegger will be revealed not only as a great philosopher, on par with the other greats, but as the greatest of them all, occupying the place of the last prophet, concluding the development of the first stage of philosophy (from Anaximander to Nietzsche) and serving as the transition, the bridge to a new philosophy, which he only anticipates in his works. In that case, Heidegger is revealed as an eschatological figure, as the final interpreter and clarifier of the deepest and most enigmatic themes of world philosophy and the creator of a radically new thinking. In this case he can be viewed as a figure of the religious pantheon, as an "envoy of being itself", a prophet and preparer of the greatest event, in which the old history of the European world will end and a new one, which has never been hitherto, will begin.

It seems to me that the second approach is more productive for a true understanding of Heidegger (even if at some time, in the distant future, it will be revised). It allows for full and complete immersion into Heidegger's thinking, without hurried attempts at interpreting him through appeals to other authorities (and to their separate traces in our consciousness) and allows Heidegger to communicate to us without hindrance what he intended to communicate. And only after accepting this message in its main features and believing in its significance and inevitability can one, if need be, take a certain distance in regards to it.

It is hardly necessary for everyone to become a Heideggerean for all time, but this thinker very exactly deserves that one dedicate significant intellectual time to him, enough to be able to say, with a light note of apprehension in one's voice, "it seems that I understanding something in him". For someone this will take years; for someone else, decades. Someone will slip in his first steps. But the experience is worth it. Studying Heidegger, we study philosophy in its contemporary state. It is precisely of such a kind, and there is nothing to oppose to it.

Heidegger is important not only for professional philosophers - for them he is simply indispensable: a contemporary philosopher who does not know Heidegger looks ridiculous. But he is meaningful also for those people who aspire to a minimal competence in questions of culture: for

humanists, politicians, artists, psychologists, sociologists; all who by the call of the heart or the obligation of fate have a relation to the fate of man, humanity, society and history.

M. Heidegger in the USSR: A Distant Shelf of the Special Collections and the Vain Diligence of Bibikhin

Heidegger's legacy in the Russian-speaking context is a profoundly peculiar phenomenon. First, the labours and ideas of the philosopher, his intellectual and paradigmatic positions, were carried off in the Soviet period into the most dangerous and unacceptable ideological compartments, placed in the most distant and closed sections of Special Collections and in the last analysis were imputed to be "as it were non-existent". Interest in Heidegger was looked at as agnoseological crime or absolutely futile pursuit. Little attention was paid even to a criticism of Heidegger's ideas. Thus, Heidegger, as also many other non-Marxist philosophers, was closed to late-Soviet (to say nothing of early-Soviet) philosophy. He was read, translated and discussed "underground", which left traces on the quality of these readings, translations and discussions.

Nevertheless, a group of Soviet philosophers, who won back the right to engage in critical readings of Heidegger, led by the late V. V. Bibikhin, the founder of the late-Soviet Heideggerean school, did come together, and out of this small circle came the majority of extant translations, many of which were made still in the Soviet era and circulated in the samizdat.

Without doubting the sincerity of these enthusiasts, we should notice that their translation work and degree of penetration into Heidegger proved entirely unsatisfactory. The difficulty of the ideological conditions, limited access to sources, the specificity of their philosophical education, limitations of philosophical knowledge, and, in general, the inadequacy of the late-Soviet social space for the expanse of Heidegger's thinking are responsible for the fact that we can without regret say goodbye to the intellectual tracts produced by this circle, if we do not want to struggle forever with the chimeras of a historical epoch so nihilous that in some ways it cannot come to an end up to the present day.

It appears that Bibikhin and his circle of like-minded thinkers were in fact vehemently captivated by Heidegger, but besides this vehemence, there is nothing in the translations or expositions of Heidegger. It is entirely impossible to read them, since these texts communicate very much about the states, efforts and sufferings of Bibikhin himself and his colleague-translators, but say practically nothing, besides accidental coincidences, about Heidegger, or give such a picture as stands one's hairs on end. If we accept these texts as a correct translation of Heidegger, then we will have to admit rather quickly, with regret, that Heidegger himself did not understand what he was saying and writing.

Heidegger as the Most Western of all the Western Philosophers

The second circumstance connected with Heidegger's peculiar legacy in the Russian-speaking context consists in the fact that Heidegger is a fundamental link of precisely Western-European philosophy and corresponds in [his] inner logic to precisely its development. Therefore he is on the whole intelligible to the Western European philosopher, who orients himself freely in the taxonomy of ideas and theories of Western European culture. To understand Heidegger, one must be, at a minimum, a European; as Heidegger himself constantly emphasizes that he thinks in Europe, of Europe and for Europe, understanding it as a particular historical-philosophical and civilizational whole.

Dogmatic Marxism and the Russian intellectual milieu, which was greatly confused both in the last decade of the USSR and today, intersect with the main development of Western European humanity in a very fragmentary, episodic and tangential way. We think of ourselves as Europeans, and we resemble them in some things (external appearance, phenotype, language, religion, socio-political system, etc.). But philosophy highlights differences: thought is that domain where it is most difficult to deceive or manipulate the state of affairs, and in this sphere there is exceedingly little in us of the Western European. If it is there, then it is like a caricature. But most likely we are dealing with a peculiar kind of Russian thinking, still weakly cognized by us ourselves; to say nothing now of the peculiarities of other cultures.

In some sense Heidegger's philosophy comprises the quintessence of Western thought: it is deeper, more central and at the same time more Western than in the case of other European thinkers whom it is simpler to break through to (although also not simple).

A calm, measured and accurate reading of Heidegger, with the preservation of one's own dignity - this, perhaps, is the most serious test for a Russian-European dialogue.

Heidegger and the Meta-Language of the New Philosophy

And finally, the third thing: Heidegger consciously sets before himself the task of establishing a new language of philosophy, a kind of meta-language. This emerges from a specific philosophy of language (*Sprachphilosophie*), which he elaborated in parallel with the general development of his thought. The essence of this approach consists:

in dismantling the influence on language and its structures of Western European philosophy and metaphysics (with their logic, grammar, implicit ontology, etc.); that is, in the rejection of an exposition

of philosophical terms in the context of that meta-language that Western European philosophy elaborated and sanctioned over its two and a half thousand year history;

in a return to words (instead of terms, categories, concepts) and their original, extra-philosophical meaning, their etymology, their own pre-logical and pre-metaphysical content;

in the elaboration of a new meta-language for a new philosophy, which will be built on the basis of words that prophesy [вещающих] about being, differing radically in trajectory from the communication of previous philosophical discourse.

The level of the Heideggerean texts demands great efforts even from a full-fledged European philosopher (in general, from a thinking European) and presents significant difficulty for German-speaking readers. But it presents even greater difficulty for the bearers of other European languages.

The question of the correct interpretation and adequate translations of Heidegger was settled in European philosophy through the entire 20th century, which gave rise to a kind of "Heideggerean dictionary", with which philosophers operate with the assistance of a range of translations, each nuance of which presents a theme for separate discussions. Not only philosophers, but also philologists, historians, scholars of antiquity, and psychologists are involved in understanding and translating Heidegger, as the difficulty of understanding Heidegger is not a technical problem, but a question of the choice of a radical turn on the path of Western philosophy, to which Heidegger summoned. Translating, interpreting and commenting on Heidegger, Europeans participate in this turn. Complexities arise in the translation of his texts into French or English not less than in their translation into Russian, but for almost a century the best minds of Europe have struggled with this problem, starting with those who read and tried to understand him in the original as one of the firsts (for instance, Jean-Paul Sartre, obliged in much to early Heidegger, including also in the name of his philosophy, "existentialism").

Heidegger's Silence

When becoming acquainted with Heidegger, we cannot omit also the historical circumstance that from 1920-1940 he belonged to the philosophical-ideological school of the "Conservative Revolution" (together with such eminent thinkers as E. Junger, F. Junger, O. Spengler, O. Spann, C. Schmitt, A. Moeller van den Bruck, W. Zombart, F. Hielscher, and others). Finding themselves in opposition to Hitler's National-Socialism and repudiating the racism, primitivism, and brutality of his populist propaganda, these thinkers were forced to cooperate with this in one way or another, not only out of considerations of survival in a totalitarian regime, but also because of the superficial resemblance of a few of the slogans of the Third Reich with the complex of Conservative Revolutionary ideas, to which, for instance, were attributed the following:

The political romanticism and idealism of the new Germany;

The idea of the necessity of Europe's return to its roots, to Tradition and to myth;

The imperative of a simultaneous war with liberalism (England, the USA) and Marxism (the USSR) as with two expressions of one and the same axiological nihilism (pragmatic in one case and proletarian in the other);

A Nietzschean diagnosis of the humanistic sickness of Europe and the necessity of a "new heroism", etc.

In the 1930s and 1940s, Heidegger openly criticized those aspects of National-Socialism that he considered erroneous from the point of view of his philosophy. In the book "Introduction to Metaphysics" in particular, Heidegger wrote, "That which is today thrown onto the market in the form of the philosophy of National-Socialism has no relation to the truth and greatness of that movement, associated with the comprehension of the connections and correspondences between contemporary humanity and globally determining technique, and fishes in the muddy waters of "values" and "totalities"[1]. It should be mentioned that the term "National-Socialism" emerged in Germany for the designation of one of the schools of "Conservative-Revolutionary" thought long before Hitler came to power and particularly before the formulation of Nazism as an ideology. Only afterwards was it usurped by the racist theoreticians of Hitler's circle.

It is evident that Heidegger thought National-Socialism through the Conservative-Revolutionary ideas of Ernst Junger's policy work, "The Worker"[2]. In it, National-Socialism is presented as contemporary Western European humanity's answer to the challenge of the epoch of modernity, [the answer] consisting in the paradoxical liberation, through the dominance of technique, of the "bottom-dwelling", the "elemental", titanic grounds of the human entity. According to E. Junger, in the mechanical grinder of modern-day war, with gas attacks and the grinding of caterpillar tanks, the European of the 20th century, swiftly losing his evaporating cultural legacy, was returning heroically, despite everything, to basic human impulses, consisting in the vivid experience of ties with comrades ("front-line socialism") and a sharp sense of the nation as a project directed to the future ("nationalism"). The "national-socialism" and "total mobilization" of E. Junger appealed to the existential roots of the European on the opposite side of petty xenophobia, chauvinism and especially any kind of racism. Such national socialism was sooner European than German, sooner humanist than statist, sooner existential than totalitarian and ideological. Heidegger considered Junger's ideas entirely adequate and supposed at first that national-socialism was capable of evolving in the direction of the "Conservative Revolution".

Having at first exerted tremendous influence over the whole "Third Way" movement in Germany in the 1920s, Junger's national-socialism gradually entered into a harsh conflict with the official dogmas of Nazism, lost itself, and was eclipsed in comparison with the much less intellectual, but incomparably

more large-scale (including in its criminal consequences) Hitlerism, which triumphed in Germany in the 1930s and which appropriated the name of this school of thought, distorted it and, for a long time, if not forever, stained it.

That same fate befell also the ideological legacy of other representatives of the European Conservative-Revolutionary movement. From the 1920s, Germany's "right-wing" and "left-wing" intellectuals - from Thomas Mann to Oswald Spengler, from Heinrich von Gleichen to the communists Wolffheim and Laufenberg, from Arthur Moeller van den Bruck to Carl Schmitt, from Ernst Niekisch to Harro Schulze-Boysen - searched for new paradigmatic, philosophical and political horizons beyond the limits of liberalism, dogmatic communism and the old, narrow conservative tradition. They actively experimented with the riskiest combinations of tradition and revolution, historical constants and innovative technologies, religious values and progressive social theories. Far from any kind of dogmatism, they elaborated many original teachings, theories and philosophical conceptions. But the tragedy of their situation consists in the fact that in the sphere of big politics, this entire broad spectrum of pursuits, revelations and intuitions began to be strongly associated with Hitler's totalitarian regime after the victory of NSDAP in 1933. And although all these thinkers gradually proved to be opposed to Hitler's regime - from "internal emigration" (the brothers F. and E. Junger, M. Heidegger, C. Schmitt) to direct participation in anti-fascist activities and in the resistance movement (E. Niekisch, Harro Schulze-Boysen and others) - the complex of their views was for a long time taboo in the political thinking of the West because of the superficial and deceptive resemblance of their views to the political declarations of the epoch of the Third Reich.

Heidegger's formal collaboration with the Nazis did not last long, when he fulfilled his duties as the rector of the University of Freiburg and was forced to submit to some decrees of the official leadership[3]. It is significant that Heidegger was, probably, the only cultural actor of such calibre (if his calibre is at all comparable to anyone else's), who did not once repent of his past after 1945. Heidegger was simply silent, and since in his philosophy silence has the fundamental significance of one of the dialectics in which being speaks of itself, then we can interpret this "Heidegger's silence" in various ways (as, by the way, with all other aspects of his work), but certainly philosophically.

Thanks to the fact that from 1920 to 1940 Heidegger exerted a decisive influence on many outstanding intellectuals who found themselves in 1945 in the camp of victors (from the Freudian-Marxist Herbert Marcuse and the communist Sartre to Heidegger's former student and lover, Hannah Arendt, who strongly criticized all forms of totalitarianism and emigrated to the USA, where she made a brilliant academic career for herself), in the general philosophical context the episode of collaboration with Hitler's regime, and even the much later "silence" of the philosopher, was politely forgotten (despite the fact that the period from 1933 to 1945 was one of the most productive in Heidegger's philosophical activity). No one besides a few superficial troublemakers (like Victor Farias and those like

him[4]) touched upon this theme anymore. Heidegger means too much for the West to throw him away, even in the event that his deeds went beyond the accepted norms of common morals. Geniuses are forgiven by everyone.

It is evident that both for the USSR and for contemporary liberal-democratic Russia these political details of Martin Heidegger's personal fate did not contribute to his adequate understanding and encouraged a notorious bias and selectivity concerning his ideas and texts (in the first place, those of the 1930s and 1940s).

The Fortuity of Successes

Owing to all of these circumstances, Heidegger is for us today an almost unknown greatness. If there is something sane in that which was written about him in Russian or in how he was translated, then this is, most likely, an accidental coincidence or lucky imitation. Russians are very successful in imitation: we can often easily reproduce what we do not at all understand and what remains inwardly alien for us. In this is the plasticity of our culture.

But even the automatic, mechanical translation of Heidegger's texts into Russian can in rare cases produce an amusing result. There are such successes among Russian Heideggereans. But since without a preliminary comprehension of Heidegger either in the original or through adequate translations into European languages it is impossible to distinguish success from failure, it would be more useful to put before oneself the task of building everything from scratch. Builders know that it is more expensive, takes longer and raises additional problems to rebuild a broken-down building than to demolish the old and erect a new edifice from scratch.

That is what is being offered to those who have taken an interest, accidentally or consciously, in the figure and philosophy of the greatest of thinking people, Martin Heidegger.

And so, inasmuch as we do not know Heidegger, I propose to carry out a journey in the direction of Heidegger, to attempt to draw nearer to him, similar to the way Yevgeny Golovin (incidentally, one of the first and most profound experts on Martin Heidegger in Russia) proposed to "draw near to the Snow Queen"[5].

The Philosopher as [an] Identity

Heidegger, as we already mentioned, thinks and presents himself exclusively in the stream and within the framework of Western European philosophy. This observation is exceedingly important for the precise determination of the position of Heideggerean thought. However great the temptation might be to consider Heidegger the religious type (as many of his researchers do), however much the parallel between Heidegger and the traditionalists with their criticism of contemporary Western civilization[6] might suggest itself, we should set aside as much as possible similar comparisons and at first familiarize ourselves with Heidegger in that context to which he belonged and wanted to belong and in which he himself comprehended his place and significance.

Heidegger is a philosopher; more precisely, a Western European philosopher, in charge of the entire legacy of Western European ontology and metaphysics, formed by it, perfectly well oriented in it, and familiar with its most minute nuances. His whole life Heidegger tried to stay within the framework of the axioms of Western European philosophy, even when he had the aim of exploding, transforming and subverting these axioms. With German pedantry, he proceeds from the moment that is conventionally thought of as the Beginning of Western European philosophy, i.e. from the Pre-Socratics, to that which is conventionally (or a little less strictly conventionally) thought of as its End; i.e. to Nietzsche.

Heidegger sees his own place in this chain as the epitomic moment for all Western philosophy; thus all these stages are intelligible to him: each of them is broken up into an entire spectrum of significant details and says much to the philosopher. Anaximander, Heraclitus and Parmenides are a resplendent trio of bearers of pre-Socratic thought; Plato and Aristotle are the highest peak of Greek thought and the originators of all subsequent European philosophy and culture. Heidegger considers the Middle Ages and Catholic Scholasticism only an episode, and the metaphysics of Modernity (from Descartes through Kant, Leibniz, Schelling, Fichte, Goethe and Hegel up to Nietzsche and Bergson) the continuation to its final logical limits of that which the Greeks began.

With a certain approximation, Heidegger's philosophy can be likened to the funeral speeches of a pastor at a burial: "The deceased was a very good man; he helped the poor; in his childhood, he did not treat those younger than him badly; he lived a worthy life, laboured much and then died; a blessed memory to him." And afterwards the pastor begins to go over the episodes of the life of the deceased in details ("he studied, married, divorced, fell ill, changed careers, retired, fell ill again..."). Heidegger's philosophy is a unfolded requiem for Western European philosophy, based on the presumption that "something was", "something began", and "something ended", "was completed", "died" (we will still come to the question of what "the beginning" signifies for Heidegger, what "something was" means - "being" is for him altogether the main concept - and what it means that "what was is no longer").

Heidegger proposes to turn to Western European philosophy, first, as to that which was, and second, as to that which is no longer, inasmuch as that which is now is not Western European philosophy. According to Heidegger, the latter ends with Nietzsche. Heidegger himself stands on the border, on the line. It is from this very sepulchral precipice [обрыв] (Abgrund)[7] that Heidegger leads his narration, dedicated to that which has died.

Here it would be incorrect to mix in religion, traditionalism or mysticism. For Heidegger, only philosophy is of decisive importance, only its processes and curves, its stations and postulates, its heights and descents are of interest. In this is his peculiar asceticism: in order to cope with the very profound crisis of contemporary nihilism, Heidegger does not seek points of support in exotic cults, in initiation, or in secret doctrines. He courageously takes upon himself the responsibility for the fate of all Western European thinking in its most Western, logos-based aspects, for which one cannot find analogues in other cultures and which comprises the essence [сущность] and fate of precisely Western civilization.

To Think With Words: Indo-European Zones of Thinking

In order to understand Heidegger, we must learn to perform two operations, to which the aforementioned peculiarities of his thinking lead us. In the first place, we must listen attentively to his language. Heidegger thinks not with concepts or categories, but with words. Not with ideas, not with principles, not with fundamentals, but with the roots of words. His thinking is verbal and radical [i.e., root-based. The word in Russian is the adjectival form of the noun "root"; корневое]. This must be taken into consideration when touching upon his texts. Their reading and comprehension demands a certain (let it be an initial) linguistic and philosophical preparation[8]. Moreover, we, like Heidegger himself in the case of the German language, must learn to think with the words and roots of our own native Russian language. Therefore, when reading Heidegger, we simultaneously:

Listen attentively (to the German words);

Comprehend (the meaning, the intention, the intension of the thought);

Translate (looking for Russian matches in words, capable of transmitting the meaning).

The reading of Heidegger must become for us a road to our own Russian language as a language of thought, a language of philosophy. This puts before us a serious problem. The thing is that if we have a good look at the area of diffusion of Indo-European languages, we shall see that each large linguistic group has its own philosophical systems with a more or less developed apparatus, based on the disclosure of the philosophical significance of the basic words of this language, either entirely or in part interspersed with the borrowing of concepts from close languages.

This is also the case with European culture, where there are three basic linguistic groups: Greek (including the language of the beginning of philosophy), Latin (in which besides Latin enter the French, Spanish, Italian, Romanian and other languages), and Germanic. All three groups have a settled philosophical language, with a long-standing tradition of the translation of the basic meanings. Heidegger breaks this norm [and] proposes to introduce new meanings, while listening attentively to the roots of words. At the same time, the work of "breaking" the philosophical meta-language comprises the lion's share of his texts; dedicated to the European philosophical tradition, native for and intelligible to Heidegger.

This continent of European meanings, with three linguistic bases, is not something self-evident for us today. We learn Latin and Greek well more and more rarely; [and] it is not a fact that we have sufficiently mastered contemporary European languages (at least German and French). But this would not be fatal if we had at least the sketch of a Russian philosophical language. Drawing a parallel with European meanings, we would break the old significations together with Heidegger, understanding what we are doing, what we are breaking, and would build the new together with him, following the trajectory of wreckage and enriching the new undertaking with a treasury of Russian roots. Thus in principle should we act, but with the exception that we have nothing to break, since our culture has not worked out a settled meta-language of Russian philosophy with conventional translations of European meanings. This produces certain problems.

In order to reject European metaphysics with Heidegger, we must understand it correctly and unambiguously. Otherwise, we will not understand the meaning or scale of his philosophizing. This is a serious obstacle. Before we outline a way out of such a position, we shall consider how the matter stands with other Indo-European cultures: do they have their own meta-language of philosophy?

In the case of Indo-European Iran, there is an extensive tradition of a specific language of philosophy, where properly Persian roots are combined with a gigantic reservoir of Arabic terminology, introduced in the course of Islamization. The French philosopher and historian of religion Henri Corbin[9] (whose work the first translations into French of fragments of Heidegger's main book "Sein und Zeit" were) in his numerous and documented works showed the breadth and specific character of Iranian thinking, with its specific meta-language, its own meanings and its particular linguistic and hermeneutic rules and practices. Corbin gives us a moving and extensive presentation of "Res Iranica", of "the Iranian thing". Heidegger did almost the same thing concerning "Res Europea"[10]. Yet another Indo-European culture, name the Hindu, also possesses an extremely developed and honed philosophical apparatus, based on Sanskrit. At the same time, Sanskrit can be considered as a kind of meta-language of the Vedanta and Vedantic cycle, while a school like the Hindu Mimamsa represents a

separate domain in the framework of the Hindu religion, set aside for the systematization of Sanskrit sounds, letters and roots, their combinations, etc[11].

Among Indo-European cultures[12], only the Slavic world, not second in its socio-political, demographic, territorial and historical parameters to the other great narodi [the notion of a narod, народ, plays an important role in the author's thought and has hence been transliterated, rather than rendered with the usual and imprecise translations "peoples" or "nation". If one thinks of a "people" as distinct from a demos and a nation as distinct from a nation-state, one will have a preliminary sense of the meaning of the word; in the author's glossary, it is given as an equivalent of the German Volk] of Indo-European descent, does not have its own philosophical meta-language, which would be something settled and composed, unambiguous and comprehensible for everybody who thinks in Russian. This forces us to ponder over the meaning of such an anomaly: why does the certainly existing Russian thing (Res Russica) just as certainly lack its own logos?

Efforts to fill this gap were undertaken by the Slavophiles, who looked for a Russian logos, and the Westernists, who attempted to artificially transfer the European logos onto Russian cultural soil. Their endeavours should be appreciated, but as a result of the Bolshevik revolution they were nullified; and "Russia the philosophical" again entered into a zone of twilight consciousness, as in many previous periods of its history, when it had whatever you please, besides full-fledged and adequate philosophical thought.

I will risk suggesting that, among all Indo-European cultural zones, the Russian zone stands "fallow" not by accident and not because of our deficiency and backwardness. In other matters (statehood, economy, technology, science, military power) we are entirely adequate. It is simply that Russians awaited the moment when the time would come to produce a new philosophy, while we rejected the old European metaphysics, which was stubbornly imposed [on us] from the West, not through foolishness, but expressly, not wishing to participate in it, guarding and preserving ourselves for something more interesting and important, for something more fundamental. If this suspicion is accurate, then we have awaited our hour: the old European metaphysics has collapsed, and the most profound, serious and responsible of the European thinkers, having attested to this fact, call upon [us] to think radically differently. Perhaps it is the very time to take part in the process of real philosophizing and to unseal the virgin treasure of Slavic, Russian speech for the creation of new meanings and new intellectual horizons, based on newly interpreted [or "comprehended"] Russian antiquity[13]. Perhaps we stood "fallow" precisely in the presentiment and expectation of exactly such a turn of the world history of thought[14].

To Think Evening-ly

At the same time, we should not for a moment drop from sight the profoundly European essence of Heidegger's thinking. For Heidegger, Europe and the West are synonyms and indicate a specific form of philosophical thought, historical being and cultural path, which express in themselves the idea of the "evening". Heidegger emphasizes: "Europe is an evening country" (the German "Abendland"). The philosophy corresponding to it is an "evening philosophy", an "evening metaphysics". The task of Western European philosophy is "to put being to sleep". In Heidegger's book "Die Geschichte des Seyns", in the footnote to the third part, "European Philosophy", we read:

"Der seynsgeschichtliche Begriff des Abendlandes. Das Land des Abends. Abend Vollendung eines Tages des Geschichte und Übergang zur Nacht, Zeit des Übergang und Bereitung des Morgens. Nacht und Tag."

"The Seynsgeschichtliche understanding of the West (the land of the evening). The land of the evening. Evening (West) - the completion of a day of history and the transition to night; time of transition and preparation for morning (tomorrow's day). Night and day." [15]

Clearly recognizing his identity as a European and European thinker, Heidegger, as also, incidentally, all Europeans, does not doubt that the path of the West, its "evening path", expresses the universal trajectory of being, which all narodi and cultures follow, but where Europeans go first; and, thus, they are first not only to descend into the night, but also to see the daybreak. Heidegger says: "Today the whole planet has become European (Western) ... By 'European' (Western) we must understand not geography and not extension of influence, but history and the primordially of the historical in it"[16].

By "history" Heidegger means Western history; i.e., the history of Western philosophy as the quintessence of history, and he supposes its most important moment "the beginning", the epoch of the emergence of philosophical thought in Greece.

The equating of Western European culture to universal [culture] reflects a "cultural racism", common for people of the West, which was in full measure characteristic for Heidegger, too[17]. However, to his credit, we must say: he himself never erred, believing that the West carries others not "progress" and "development", but nihilism, "wilderness", "oblivion of the question of being", decomposition and death (all the charms of night). The contemporary West is universal, but in the way

that decomposition and death are universal. Heidegger saw the most profound form of this degeneracy in "Americanism", which he thought of as "planetarism" (today we would say "globalism" and "globalization"). "Planetarism is the inversion of the beginning (of Western philosophy) into the beinglessness of its development"[18]. At the origins of its evening path the West still illumined the world for other cultures with the rays of the setting sun. In the last epoch, "Americanism", "pragmatism", "technique", and "calculation" carry mankind only putrefaction. But in this putrefaction, perversion and nihility of the contemporary West, Heidegger saw meaning and universal significance.

Being a thinker of the West, Heidegger thinks eveningly; even more than eveningly - nocturnally. He sees his mission in summarizing the whole Western philosophical tradition. In some sense his books are the last thing that can be said in the "evening language". Heidegger's language is not the language of Heidegger as an individual; it is the final chord of the Western European language. Heidegger is the last point of Western European thinking. He and his philosophy are not a particular case; they are destiny, fate (in the sense of the fulfilment of the afore-spoken). "At the beginning of language lies a poem", Heidegger says. At the end of language lies the philosophy of Martin Heidegger. And it wants to become the beginning of a new language, a presage of the language of the morning.

Heidegger thought that in the last centuries, Germans, among all other Europeans, starting with Goethe, Leibniz, Kant, the Romantics, Schelling, Fichte, Hegel and up to Nietzsche, were responsible for the world (he calls "world", *die Welt*, the totality of beings in the whole - *das Seiende im Ganzen*). From the ancient Greeks he traces a direct line to German classical philosophy, and further to himself.

[1] Heidegger M. Einführung in die Metaphysik. Tübingen, 1953. pg. 202. First published in 1935.

[2] Jünger E. Der Arbeiter. Herrschaft und Gestalt. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982

[3] He became a member of the NSDAP May 1 1933 and remained one until 1945, despite serious complaints against his

from the official party organs and gradual marginalization in the framework of the regime.

[4] Farias V. Heidegger and Nazism. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.

[5] Golovin, Y. An Approach to the Snow Queen. M., 2003.

[6] While studying the philosophy of traditionalism for a long time (see in particular the books "Absolute Fatherland",

"The Philosophy of Traditionalism", and "The Radical Subject and its Double"), I did not accent Heidegger's teaching,

although it influenced my intellectual formation in the most direct and immediate manner. My views, my worldview, are

indebted to the philosophy of Heidegger only slightly less than to the ideas of Guenon. Heidegger is a part of our

worldview, our political theory, our philosophy; he is a sine qua non. Heidegger is no less fundamental than Guenon. But

he is another. A comparison of Heidegger and Guenon must not be carried out too hurriedly. We must thoroughly master

Guenon separately, and Heidegger separately. And then - only then! - should we think about in what they overlap (and in what they differ). It is incorrect to interpret one from the other. In my opinion, J. Evola in his "Ride the Tiger" (M. 2005) made the mistake of too hurried and superficial an interpretation of Heidegger from traditionalist (generalized, Guenonist) positions, where he presents exceedingly wrongly and in a distorted manner Heidegger's ideas and terminology, and even less soundly, and even naively, criticizes them.

[7] The German "Abgrund", i.e. "abyss", a very important term for Heidegger's philosophy, originally meant precisely

"precipice", "abrupt vertical decline", "chasm".

[8] Nietzsche called one of his works "We Philologists" (Nietzsche F. Collected Works. V. 3 T. 3. M: REFL, 1994). The reading of Heidegger's philosophy is a matter precisely for "philologists" in the Nietzschean sense.

[9] Corbin H. The Light of Glory and the Holy Grail. Shiite Literature of the Grail. Sufism and Sophia. The Musical Feeling of Islamic Religion. <http://www.fatuma.net/corbin/corbin00.htm>. Also by Corbin: The Man of Light in Iranian Sufism. // The Magical Mountain. 1998. No 1; History and Persian Mysticism. The Prophetic Philosophy and Metaphysics of Being. M., 1985.

[10] Taking into account that Corbin told Europeans about Iranian thought, while Heidegger told the Europeans about

their own tradition.

[11] Outside the Indo-European context, equally well developed is the philosophical terminology of the Jewish Kabbalah

(where sounds, the forms of letters and the meaning of basic roots are interpreted) or Islamic esotericism, based on Arabic

and the sacred book of the Muslims, the Koran.

[12] As paradigmatic and philosophical potencies in the general fabric of Indo-European culture, there remain in the shade

also "abortive civilizations" (in Toynbee's terminology), like the Celtic, Letto-Lithuanian (including Prussian), the Phrygian

(including their descendents the Romans), and also the disappeared civilizations of the Minoans, Pelasgians, Hittites,

Tocharians, Scythians, Sarmatians. It is possible that the reconstruction of their philosophical message still awaits its hour.

[13] V. V. Kolesov has a brilliant work on the roots and meaning of ancient Russian words and their evolution (V. V.

Kolesov. Ancient Rus: The Legacy of the Word. SPB., 2000.)

[14] The words of R. Guenon and H. Corbin, who will methodologically help us understand what precisely we strive to

discover in the general legacy of the Slavic now Russian-Slavic cosmos, possess fundamental significance for the

realization of this task

[15] Heidegger M. Geschichte des Seyns (1938/1940). Gesamtausgabe. Bd. 69. Frankfurt am Mein: Vittorio Klosterman, 1998. pg. 6.

[16] Heidegger M. Über den Anfang. Gesamtausgabe. Bd. 70. Frankfurt am Mein: Vittorio Klosterman, 2005. pg. 107.

[17] Just like his teacher E. Husserl. For Husserl, the question "whether European humanity carries in itself the absolute

idea, whether it is empirically a fixed anthropological type, similar to how the residents of China or India are; in this case,

whether the Europeanization of other nations is evidence of the absolute meaning entering the meaning of the world and is

far from historical meaninglessness?" is purely rhetorical; of course, "European humanity carries in itself the absolute idea"

(Husserl E. The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology. SPB., 2004). Heidegger also thought

likewise. Implicitly or explicitly, practically all the people of the West are sure of this.

[18] Heidegger M. Über den Anfang. Op. cit. pg. 107.

Translation of Michael Millerman

Fourth Political Theory: shortest presentation

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

So now we are fully prepared and armed to interpret correctly the (political) world around us and to treat it as it deserves.

The easiest way to understand what is Fourth Political Theory is to attentively concentrate on following suite of pictures.

1. Fourth Political Theory. Its symbol means number 4 and the sign of Jupiter the planet of Order and Monarchy. It is patriarchal Indo-European symbol of the God of the Heaven -- Dyaus, Zeus, Deus.

2. Any Political Theory is defined by the paradigms of History - being fully dependent of them. So in order to understand 4PT correctly we need to consider what three basic paradigms are:

Pre-Modernity (traditional society)

Modernity (modern society)

Post-Modernity (a kind of post-society or dis-society where all social ties and all forms of collective identity – including gender - are destroyed, made “optional”)

3. Three main Political Theories (liberalism, communism and nationalism aka "fashism") belong to the second paradigm – i.e. to the Modernity. All three of them are essentially modern and they are dealing

with the ontological and gnoseological (epistemological) map of philosophy of Enlightenment with the Cartesian concept of subject as the center.

4. The three Political Theories can be situated in the space with special characteristics of directions. So 1st Political Theory (liberalism) has its topological place in the center and in the highest point of open (it is essential!) circle. 2nd Political Theory (communism / socialism) is to the left. 3rd Political Theory (nationalism, fascism) is to the right. Being in the middle the position of liberalism is central in the philosophical sense. It is the point that defines where is left and where is right. Left and right obtain the meaning only in relation to the 1st Political Theory. So it is why the liberalism is so important. And it is why it is winning as long as Modernity rests unquestioned and unchallenged.

5. Three Political Theories propose three versions of Cartesian subject identifying it:

with the individual (1st Political Theory -- liberalism),

with class (2nd Political Theory -- communism / socialism),

with nation/race (3rd Political Theory -- nationalism, fascism, nazism).

6. The relations and alliances between three Political Theories can be different. There are (were) such options as 1PT+2PT vs 3PT (WWII) or 2PT+3PT vs 1PT (Ribbentrop-Molotov pact). History shows that both types of alliances were tested in XX century where the competition between three Political Theories was a main ideological stake.

7. After the common victory of 1PT+2PT over 3PT in WWII, 3PT has disappeared from the political reality. From 1945 it either belongs to the past, or has completely lost its meaning and the real influence on world politics and the societies. From that moment the struggle between 1PT and 2PT has begun. That was the meaning of the second half of XX century from the standpoint of ideology.

8. The end of XX century has turned out to be the end of the battle between 1PT and 2PT. The 1PT has definitively won and from that moment it rests the only Political Theory that represents the Modernity as such on the ideological level. The liberalism has triumphed and became the universal system of thought (Pensée Unique) on the world scale. Hence the globalization and so on. From 1991 with the fall of Berlin's wall we have entered in the context of planetarian Liberal Empire. There can not be any more neither 3PT, nor 2PT. All that vaguely remind them are the liberal simulacra.

9. The historical moment we are living in is essentially unipolar - not only geopolitically (with USA and NATO as global center) but as well ideologically - with the clear and absolute domination of liberalism (of all kinds -- left, right, far left or far right). We can accept such status quo (as political global elites and the masses convinced and mind-controlled by them do) or challenge it. But the problem is we cannot oppose to 1PT any more 2PT or 3PT - both are instrumentalized by liberals. So we are in a sort of trap. The absolute domination of liberalism (1PT) doesn't let us have any serious alternative pretending that there is nothing of that kind and can not be. So we are obliged to rest inside the unipolar moment or to spin along curves of the labyrinths of artificial simulacra - between far left anarcho-communist liberalism and far right big capital liberalism.

10. Here the horizon of 4PT appears. If we still insist on the Alternative (because being human we are essentially free and thus we can accept or reject anything) and understand the ideological meaning of the history of the Modernity (refusing to join the pseudo-leftist and pseudo-rightist camps), we need an Alternative beyond 2PT and 3PT. From that logically follows the necessity of Fourth Political Theory (4PT).

We need to remark that Modernity ends precisely with the global victory of 1PT (liberalism). So the End of History by F.Fukuyama is in the reality the End of Modernity. And thus it is beginning of Post-Modernity. But the Post-Modernity is essentially liberal because it is manifesting itself inside the liberalism (not outside of it). So it is the liberalism that define the conditions of Post-Modernity. Post-Modernity is not (as it is given now) the alternative of Modernity. It is its highest phase, its culmination. So Post-Modernity is based on the complete and absolute victory of 1PT. That is why Post-Modernity has to be global (uniting the implosion of man to the subhuman fragments in the micro-level and in the same time insisting on the progressive integration on the global and transnational macro-level). Post-Modernity can not be local or regional.

But in this moment of passage from the Modernity toward (liberal/post-liberal) Post-Modernity where the very principles of social, political and geopolitical order are shaking, it is the time to propose Alternative. Not only alternative to liberalism (1PT), but the Alternative to the Modernity - because 1PT is the essential political expression of the political Modernity. 1PT struggled during last centuries against 3PT and 2PT for the right to embody the very nature of Modernity and it has won. So those in search of Alternative (4PT) shouldn't be hypnotized any more by the Modernity or seduced by its post-modern perverted development. The rediscovery of Pre-Modernity is the only logical step. Here we are meeting with traditionalist philosophy and the essential critics of Modern World as a concept.

Constructing the 4PT we arrive to the rediscovery of the Pre-Modernity understood not as the past, but as the a-temporal structure of principles and values belonging to the different philosophical Universe (where exist Eternity, God or gods, angels, souls, devil, end of time and resurrection of dead). The concept of past (as as something that is not any more) with pejorative connotation is essentially Modern concept based in its turn on the negation of the dimension of Eternity and absolutization of the time (becoming). The Pre-Modernity is not the past. The Pre-Modernity is society, culture, Weltanschauung and political system constructed on the fundamental belief in the Eternity. The Modernity denies that - hence its chrono-centric epistemology.

In the context of Modernity we are dealing with Cartesian subject. Its actual normative interpretation is liberal one -- individual. So we need to deconstruct this concept of individual making appeal to the pre-modern understanding of human being and its essence.

11. But the problem is where can we find the fulcrum? The Modernity and Post-Modernity - precisely by means of Third Totalitarianism (this time liberal one) - have destroyed already the humanity and replaced it by the assembly of individuals (human rights doctrine). Refusing normative subject of all-

pervading liberalism (individual and - in the near future - post-human species) we are in the void because liberalism doesn't accept institutionally (!) any form of non-individual ontology and anthropology. And the pre-modern version of subject, of human nature are considered to be obsolete and miserable – in the extreme case criminal. If we insist nevertheless they will qualify as the residui and treat us in the same manner as in the first stage of Enlightenment - simply killing us as Jacobins and bolsheviks killed the Christians priests and princes. May be it is an option for certain men and women. The way of martyrdom is great path.

But there is other solution. Not being able to certify our own existence in the conceptual field of totalitarian liberalism we can make appeal to Heidegger's concept of Dasein. When the concept of human being is obligatory fake and the liberal totalitarian culture splits the human figure more and more depriving it of any order or unity as well as of any collective identity (more than that --depriving it of any identity at all) Dasein nevertheless is here - it is always here or rather t/here. It is here - existing in authentic or inauthentic way, but it is here! So 4PT invites to take Dasein as the axial fulcrum when everything else is missing. The return to the Tradition and to the Eternity can be accomplished neither by individual nor by class or nation. Dasein is the ontological root of the human being, the nucleus of Being. Dasein can be put in the wrong way of functioning but still it is present. So it is our final argument and the main feature of 4PT. Fourth Political theory is existential. And starting from Dasein we can make the eschatological leap to the Tradition. Else we would lack the foothold. Traditionalism is to be existential otherwise it will be but one simulacrum more.

12. So we have arrived to the main structure of 4PT. Now everything is perfectly clear (I hope).

13. All these philosophical considerations (conceptual steps rendering the structure of Fourth Political Theory explicit) can be translated in the political praxis. It is only one possible way to project the main idea of 4PT to the reality of many other, but it is the more evident application. In the last scheme we observe where we are politically, with whom we have to fight and what kind of alliances we should conclude. This map of the ideological reality becomes each day more and more transparent and obvious. So now we are fully prepared and armed to interpret correctly the (political) world around us and to treat it as it deserves.

Hegel and the Platonic Leap Down

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Geopolitica.ru

On November 14th, 1831 the greatest romantic philosopher in the world history of thought, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), died. Heidegger, along with Nietzsche, believed Hegel to be the one who completed the history of the philosophy of the Western Logos and the pinnacle of the history of philosophy and philosophy in general. If Plato was the philosopher of the beginning, then Hegel and Nietzsche were the philosophers of the end. In this sense, Hegel was the summative philosopher.

Everything is the otherness of the Other

Hegel's political philosophy is very complex. It is based on his overall philosophical picture. As we have seen, every philosophy always has the possibility of eliciting a political dimension. Like Plato, Hegel in his philosophy of right makes this gesture, takes his whole philosophy and applies it to politics, i.e., he explicitly locates the place of political philosophy in the context of his philosophy as a whole. Through philosophy, he explains political philosophy, simultaneously clarifying politics through its metaphysical dimension.

In this respect, Hegel is a classical philosopher who implicitly includes political philosophy. In this sense, Heidegger was absolutely right when he said that if we understood *The Phenomenology of the Spirit*, then we could deduce everything else from it. As for reading, two fundamental works of Hegel's are habitually suggested: *The Phenomenology of the Spirit* and *Philosophy of Right*.

Hegel's basic idea is that there exists the primordial Subjective Spirit, the "spirit for itself" (German: *der subjektive Geist*). This point coincides with the theological thesis on God's existence – the Subjective Spirit is God for Himself. In order to employ itself for the Other, this Subjective Spirit projects itself in the Objective Spirit (German: *der objektive Geist*) in which it becomes nature and matter, i.e., the subject projects itself in the object.

Note the fundamental difference here with the Cartesian topology which predetermined the structure of modernity. For Descartes, there is a dualism between subject and object, whereas Hegel tries to remove this dualism and overcome Kant's epistemological pessimism through distinguishing matter or the object from the Spirit. In fact, this is nothing more than a development of the Kantian model of the absolute "I am," but taken in a dynamic, dialectical model. If Fichte was a reaction to Kant, then Hegel is a reaction to Fichte, but in constant dialogue with Kant and Cartesianism.

Thus, Hegel argues that there exists the Subjective Spirit which reveals itself through the Objective Spirit via dialectical alienation. The Thesis is the Subjective Spirit and the Antithesis is the Objective Spirit, or nature. Therefore, nature is not nature since, according to Hegel, nothing is identical to itself, but everything is an otherness of the Other, hence the term "dialectic."

The cycle of departure and return: the Absolute Spirit

In other words, there is the Subjective Spirit as such which projects itself as the Antithesis. And thus begins history. For Hegel, the philosophy of history is of fundamental significance because history is nothing other than the process of unfolding of the Objective Spirit which acquires at the new stage its spiritual component lying at its essence. But the first act of the Objective Spirit is to hide its spiritual character, to impersonate matter or nature, and then throughout history this otherness of the Subjective Spirit returns, by man and human history, to its essence.

But then this is a new essence; this is no longer the Subjective Spirit (the "spirit for itself") nor a "spirit for another", but a "spirit in itself." In other words, the spirit returns to itself through its own alienation. Thus arises the cycle of departure and return, the latter of which was more important for Hegel than the departure. The latter creates the preconditions for the return, and the return, passing the entire cycle, returns to the Subjective Spirit itself, becoming the third spirit – the Absolute Spirit (German: der absolute Geist). That is, first there is the Subjective Spirit, then the Objective Spirit, and then the Absolute Spirit.

The Absolute Spirit, according to Hegel, unfolds over the course of human history and draws towards the end of history. The meaning of history is the Spirit's realization of itself through matter. First the Spirit has itself, but is not self-aware, then it begins to realize itself, but does not have itself. Nature in and of itself harbors the preconditions of history because it is an element of history. Hence the history of religion, the history of societies, and as a result of the Spirit's unfolding through history, it reaches its

climax in the end of history, when the Spirit is fully conscious of and has itself. Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis. Thus, history is finished.

This is a general picture of Hegel's philosophy, which has many nuances and complexities. Thus, according to Hegel, history moves positively, but this is a different positivism than that in the philosophy of the Great Mother. The titanic beginning implies that in the beginning there was lesser and then greater. In his reading of Hegel, Marx removed the Subjective Spirit and said that there is self-perfecting nature. Thus, he restored the philosophy of the Great Mother according to which everything grows out of matter and nature.

But Hegel is not Marx. In Hegel, this growth, this process, this movement from the bottom upwards is based on the fact that in the beginning there was a leap downwards. First the Spirit leaps and falls into nature, and therefore nature begins to grow, and nature is not so much other as it is the otherness of the Spirit. The Antithesis to the Spirit is not simply its opposite – for it itself is also such in removed form. The concept of “removal” in Hegel is very important, as the Antithesis does not destroy the Thesis, but removes it, absorbs it, and then demonstrates through the Synthesis.

Therefore, the Thesis is not absolute, and the Antithesis is not absolute. All of them are dialectically dependent. Only their Synthesis is absolute through which occurs the removal of the Thesis and the Antithesis. In this sense, the Hegelian understanding of history as the unfolding of the Spirit happens through phases: there is the (prehistoric) Subjective Spirit, the Objective Spirit, which manifests itself through history, and finally the Absolute Spirit, which manifests itself through the higher tension of history, through the creation of some kind of cultural and socio-political peak, the pyramid of the Spirit, which finally became the Absolute.

Hegel and the idea of the German state

Where does political philosophy figure here? Clearly, in some sense history becomes political. Hence why in Hegel there is the concept of the evolution of political systems, models, and regimes as moments of becoming of the Absolute Spirit. Politics is the crystallization of the Synthesis. Political history is the movement of the Spirit to becoming Absolute. Politics is the history of the absolutization of the Spirit.

Hegel establishes a hierarchy between different political forms. On the one hand, this is an evolutionary hierarchy since each regime is better than the previous. But, unlike Marx's ideas, this evolution is at the

same time not only a reflection of the Antithesis, and it is not the development of matter or nature. This is the distinguishing of the Spirit which was originally inherent in matter and nature. As follows, there is no materialism here. We are dealing with a complex scheme which combines the Platonic option (in the beginning there was Spirit, not matter) and the evolutionary model (in which we begin to consider history from the Antithesis, which is reminiscent of the idea of the Great Mother). Marx amputated the Platonic part, hence his reinterpretation of Hegel in an exclusively materialist sense. But Hegel is more complex.

Another important point in Hegel is how he defines the political end of history, the peak of the becoming of political history and the expression of the Absolute Spirit. Here Hegel says something interesting about Prussia and the German state. The Germans did not have a state, so historically there was no such expression. Thus, the Germans absorb the logic of world movement, and the Prussian-German state is the expression of the Absolute Spirit. All of history is thus a prelude to the formation of Germany in the 19th century. Hegel said that great peoples are those who have either a great state or great philosophy. He said that the Russians have a great state, while in the 19th century the Germans had no state whatsoever. As follows, the Germans must have great philosophy – and then a great state.

The most striking is that Hegel formulated the philosophy of a great German state before Germany appeared. He forged this theory while he himself lived in a fragmented Germany of principalities that was anything but a powerful and strong state. Hegel assembled Germany, endowed it with an intellectual mission, and created, along with Fichte and Schelling, the idealist, romantic concept of German statehood as an expression of the Spirit becoming Absolute. The peak and the end of history, according to Hegel, is therefore the German state.

Moreover, Hegel thought that the most optimal political system is an enlightened monarchy dominated by political Hegelian philosophers, the bearers of the Synthesis of the whole world Spirit who recognize the logic of world history. Hegel considered himself to be a prophet of philosophy, humanity, and Germany, and in some sense he was a mystic. Methodologically, Hegel's philosophy was absolutely rational, but it was irrational in its premises. He substantiated the idea that civil society, the French Revolution, and the Enlightenment epoch were another, dialectical moment in the formation of enlightened monarchy. Civil society is that out of which monarchy grows, and which monarchy abolishes. Thus, Hegel was a mystical monarchist who considered the logic of history to be the path of different political forms towards Russian monarchy.

It is no surprise that this idea was taken by the Italian fascists, especially in the theory of the Italian state of Giovanni Gentile, who was a Hegelian. Paradoxically, neither fascism nor Nazism can be seen as

representative of classical nationalism. In these two worldviews, there were certain elements that do not lend themselves to being considered as classical or even radical forms of European bourgeois nationalism, because in this case the addition of the Hegelian instance in the form of the Subjective Spirit, and all of the metaphysics of history which Gentile laid in the foundations of the theory of Italian fascism were simply Hegelianism applied to Italy.

Despite the fact that he is considered a classic of political philosophy, Hegel is a rather complex, compound case. His political philosophy does not mirror the ideology of the Third Way, and Marxist theory was built on metaphysically truncated Hegelianism. In other words, “left” Hegelianism became the basis of the Second Political Theory, and “right” Hegelianism influenced some of the peculiarities of the Third Political Theory. Moreover, the Hegelian idea of the end of history was taken up and applied to the liberal model by his student, Alexandre Kojève [1], his follower Francis Fukuyama, and other philosophers. Marx applied the “end of history” to communism, Gentile to the state, and some Hegelian philosophers to the triumph of liberal world order. Therefore, the latter said, civil society is not a prolegomena to monarchy (as Hegel himself believed), but the peak of the development of human civilization.

This idea was taken as a premise by Francis Fukuyama, who employed the term “end of history.” This term was of fundamental importance to Hegel insofar as it marked the final moment of the Spirit’s achievement of its absolute phase through history, the dialectical moment of the Spirit’s return to itself, in itself, and for itself – the Synthesis.

Thus, we can find in Hegelianism all three of the classical ideologies of modernity, but this does not mean that Hegelianism can be qualified from the point of view of any one of them. Hegel is broader than all the political theories of modernity, and therefore does not lapse into them. As follows, in Hegelianism there is that which was pilfered in fragments by the three political ideologies of modernity, as well as that which was not taken, such as the idea of the primordial Subjective Spirit which precedes any downward movement. This element of the primordial Platonic leap, Neoplatonism, which then transitions into more or less progressive-evolutionary topologies, allows us to refrain from classifying Hegel as one of the philosophers or political philosophers of modernity, because, as we have seen, the paradigm of modernity does not presume any prior matter component.

A non-liberal, non-Marxist, and non-fascist reading of Hegel allows us to reveal his components for an alternative to modernity and integrate him into the Fourth Political Theory. Through this operation, we move Hegel from the epoch of modernity in which he lived and thought into another context. This is another Hegel, another political philosophy of Hegel in which the focus is on the Platonic leap

downwards. This part of his philosophy did not, and indeed could not receive political embodiment in the framework of the paradigm of modernity. Nevertheless, it can find expression in the context of the Fourth Political Theory.

Footnotes:

[1] The Russian philosopher Aleksandr Kozhevnikov changed his name to Alexandre Kojève after emigrating.

Herman Wirth: Runes, Great Yule, and the Arctic Homeland

April 13, 2017

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

[The foreword to *Signs of the Great North: The Hyperborean Theory* (Moscow, Veche: 2008); originally an episode of Dugin's "Historico-Magical Meditative Radio Show" FINIS MUNDI]

There exists no greater mystery in human existence than the mystery of life and death, dying and becoming. For man, the Year is the supreme Revelation of divine action in the Universe. The Year is the expression of God's providential cosmic law, in accordance with which occurs the becoming of the world in the infinite and everlasting return. The most magical and profound phenomenon before us in nature is the Year of God. A number of days makes up the Year, and in each of these days is opened the image of the Year: the birth of the Light from which comes all life, its climb to the highest peak, and its descent, death, and sinking, only to rise again. The morning, noon, evening, and night in a day correspond to spring, summer, autumn, and winter in the Year.

In spring, the "Light of the World" once again awakens all life, rectifies, and develops until it reaches its full deployment and limit of growth at the noon-summer time, then to once again begin the path to night and winter, preparing for death, after which inevitably follows new birth. The Nordic man beheld the image of his existence daily and yearly: early in the morning was his childhood, later his youth, then at noon and in the summer was his maturing, full maturity, and then the decay of life and old age leading to the winter of death, and through this to new life, to the rebirth and new becoming embodied in offspring. The cycle of the day reflects in its permanent and uninterrupted repetition the yearly cycle, as the Year is the circle of human life. The cycle, circular motion, and rotation itself is the supreme cosmic law of God, the ethical Foundation of the Universe of all beings. On this principle rests every consideration of God and every sense of justice. The law of eternal rotation, whose expressions are space and time, especially realized in the Year, were recognized by the Atlanto-Nordic race in the symbol of the Year and World Tree, the Tree of Life.

These words are from the book of the great Dutch scholar, Herman Wirth. His name can be mentioned to few modern men, even highly educated people, and his works cannot be found in modern university libraries, but the reason for this will be understood later. Nevertheless, Herman Wirth was one of those people who in our century, in this dark period of the Iron Age, the Kali Yuga, did an astonishing amount for the restoration of the Great Tradition from the time of the Golden Age and the mysterious region of Hyperborea – the magical, Apollonian land lying in the Far North. René Guénon and Julius Evola spoke of the Primordial Tradition and the polar paradise, and their names are known to all Traditionalists. But very few know of Herman Wirth even though this tall, thin professor, modest and passionate like any genuine scholar, discovered the secret of secrets of this Primordial Tradition, reconstructed its language, revealed the secrets of the ancient runes, and deciphered the message of the Golden Age.

This may seem incredible, but it is a fact. Herman Wirth did no more and no less than recreate the “Sacred Proto-Language of Humanity”, *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit*, the very name of one of his thick, astounding, fundamental books.

Herman Wirth was born in 1885 in Utrecht, the Netherlands. His family descended from a line of ancient Frisians, the inhabitants of the northern regions of Holland differing to this day in their unusual height and classical Indo-European facial features. From his childhood, Wirth was interested in the history of his country and his people. He collected tales and legends, and attentively studied the signs and symbols which decorated the homes of ordinary Dutch peasants.

Wirth explored his entire country far and wide. In 1910, he defended his thesis entitled *The Degradation of Dutch Folk Song* and already in this first work surprised others with his incredible erudition, which subjected to analysis practically all available material relating to Dutch folklore. Moreover, he attempted to construct a general model, a kind of proto-mythology that stood behind all folk art and which could help one better understand the holistic worldview of the ancient ancestors. Proceeding from the symbols and elements of Dutch antiquity, Wirth expanded the range of his ethnographic, cultural, symbolical searches first to all the Germanic lands, and then broader to Europe, Eurasia, and, finally, to the regions most distant from Europe itself: America, Oceania, Africa, and so on. In search of a formula that could generalize the worldview of the ancient Aryan ancestors, Wirth moved in a spiral, clarifying, correcting, extending, or re-considering all the information hitherto gathered by linguists, archaeologists, historians of religion and art, anthropologists, etc. His endeavor was one of incredible intensity.

Herman Wirth mastered a few hundred – just imagine, a few hundred! – ancient languages, seeking to find in them some kind of common patterns dating back to forgotten times. The models that Wirth

developed anticipated the “Nostratic theory” of Illich-Svitych which appeared only much later, according to which the populations of Europe, Asia, and Africa spoke the same language at the dawn of humanity.

But Herman Wirth was unique by virtue of more than just his dazzling intellect. Unlike the positivist scientific community, he categorically disagreed with confining oneself to small spaces and spending one’s entire life clarifying and double-checking minor details, as was accepted practice among scholarly circles in the “critical,” pessimistic century. Wirth, like the scholars of the Middle Ages, strove to cover an enormous field of knowledge at one time. His approach was not analytical, but synthetic. Therefore, for a fundamental historical hypothesis he appeals not to chaotic and isolated fragments of modern anthropologists’ studies which idolize fact, but to ancient myths, Tradition, and sacred sources. Like René Guénon, Wirth understood that the modern world is an anomaly, regression, and degeneration, and that truth is to be sought in myths, symbols, legends, religions, cults, rites, and folklore.

Yima – the First Man – acted on the advice of Ahura Mazda and built the city of Vara in the Far North surrounded by a wall and brought there the seeds of all the best from people, animals, and plants to preserve them from the fatal winter, the punishment of the spirit of evil, Angra Mainyu, descending upon the sacred land of happiness. Yima built the city of the golden arrow and made the gates luminescent and others into lights. And Spitama Zarathustra asked Ahura Mazda: ‘O creator of the material world, worthy decreer of the Aryans and builder of Asha! What are these lights in the city built by Yima?’ And Ahura Mazda replied: ‘These lights are both eternal and transient. Only once a year do they rise and descend in the city of Vara, the Stars, Moon, and the Sun. The city’s inhabitants believe the whole year to be one Day.

This fragment from the Bundahishn, the sacred book of the Zoroastrians, can be interpreted in different ways, as can many of Tradition’s other indications that in the Far North in forgotten times there existed an amazing country of paradise, Hyperborea (Thule, Varahi) where the joyful ancestors of the golden-haired, blue-eyed Aryans lived, the divine race of kings and heroes. Herman Wirth treated Tradition’s message literally, and this allowed him to create a unique theory of the origin of mankind, “Der Aufgang der Menschheit,” decipher ancient signs, explain the secret, unfathomable sides of archaic symbols, cults, and rituals, grasp the meaning of sacred rites, and restore the long-lost alphabet of the humanity of paradise. This may seem impossible. Why has such a fantastic discovery remained unnoticed by the general public? How can such stunning, breathtaking revelations be passed over? Why are both ordinary people and the scientific community not told of such a scholar’s name? Alas, once again, political incorrectness. Herman Wirth had the temerity to join at a young age the patriotic national movement of Holland, and later Germany. Wirth was the inspiration behind the Dutch youth movement, Dietske Trekvogels, an analogue of the German Wandervogel. This was a broad youth organization whose members visited rural areas, collected national folklore, and invested the typical revolutionary

enthusiasm of youth into a paradoxical interest in the archaic. They hated the modern world, the commercial spirit of cities and stock exchanges, and the cynical attitude of the corrupt cosmopolitan hell into which Europe had inexorably slipped by the beginning of the 20th century. The anarchism of the Wandervogel was coupled with love for their people, the customs of their ancestors, and Tradition. By the 1930's, this tendency could not but become a component part of another political movement whose name alone draws feelings of terror among today's well-intentioned citizens. The ideas and works of Herman Wirth, the great restorer and discoverer of the most ancient proto-language of humanity, became unfortunately associated with a political regime that became extremely unpopular after the mid 1940's. In the end, the North and its light, its people, its Tradition, and its symbols henceforth became politically incorrect.

Herman Wirth formulated the foundations of his theory in 1928 in his work *Der Aufgang der Menschheit* ("The Ascent of Mankind"). He believed that all the mentions of the ancient continent lying at the North Pole are not myths or fantasies, but historical fact. To confirm this hypothesis, he referred to the writings of modern geologists, in particular Wegener, according to whom continents are not in constant rest, but are constantly sliding along the shelf and can therefore move around the globe over fairly large intervals of time. Once upon a time, in the North Pole there existed a continent where different atmospheric conditions reigned. Memory of this continent was preserved in ancient legends, myths, and tales, etc. It is from this continent that the spiritual culture of humanity united in a common formula began to spread.

The basis of this culture, this Hyperborean cult, was not simply the Year, but the Year beheld in polar conditions in which a month lasts six months and six months a night. According to Herman Wirth, descriptions of the Polar Year lay at the heart of all sacred texts and cults, symbols, and signs from the cave paintings and first markings on mammoth bones to the most refined and sophisticated theological and mystical constructs. This fact, which other modern historians of religion and anthropologists had not considered, can be explained very simply. If we merely apply calendric cult circles to the primordial conditions of the lands on which we encounter the remains of ancient cultures, such as Sumer, India, Eurasia, the Pyrenees, the Mediterranean, the Middle East, etc., then it is impossible to trace genuine correspondences since only part of the hieroglyphs remain unchanged since Hyperborean, polar times, while a portion were constructed under new, non-polar and non-arctic circumstances. The real key to interpreting ancient symbols is given only by accepting the hypothesis of a polar, nordic origin of civilization. But this hypothesis had never been seriously considered by anyone.

"A Day of the Gods equals one human year" – this assertion can be found in the Rig Veda, the Avesta, Ancient Greek myths, the Germanic sagas, Sumerian epics, and in archaic fragments of the Bible. The German Professor Herman Wirth took this literally and thus proceeded to make an incredible, unheard of discovery.

The first people were not Neanderthaloid idiots huddling in caves and poking each other with sticks as Darwinists, Marxists, and other profane thinkers assert. They were fully-fledged human beings with a refined, simple, yet ultimately spiritual worldview. They were the bearers of the Supreme Religion of Light, Purity, and the Spirit. They did not know of a detached Creator God acting on humanity and nature as if on something external. The whole world was permeated with divine energies, and people themselves were seen as children of the Sun, descendants of Gods, as angelic, supreme beings professing a particular world view, a God-worldview, or *Gottesweltanschauung*. They did not need morality or laws insofar as moral and religious law was in them. These were tall, blond-haired and blue-eyed beings for whom ill thoughts, the spirit of greed, lust for power, and other subhuman defects were alien. Interestingly enough, Wirth was for some time close to the Dutch Communists, in whose plans he saw a return to the primordial, supreme, Nordic system. Of course, the Nordic-Aryan communism of Professor Wirth somewhat differed from the Marxian utopia. Wirth put forth the theory of a polar “proto-monotheism,” a “proto-God.” All elements of this most ancient ritual were in strict accordance with the harmony of cosmic Nature. There were no strict barriers between the human, natural, social, religious, and temporal.

Dualism was unknown. Thought and matter, spirit and substance, the particular and the whole, the natural and the social, and the divine and non-divine all existed in total harmony and determined a single formula, knowledge of which can be deciphered by not only linguistic and symbolic figures – products of artificial human origin – but the language of nature, the voices of animals, plants, rocks, and mountains. Here Wirth ultimately transcends the materialism generally accepted at the time in scholarly circles. He believed that the great sacred formula lying at the heart of polar civilization was not simply a description of the external world, but magical thought itself given flesh. “God creates thinking”, Wirth quotes the famous phrase of an Icelandic runic song. Knowledge is Being, both coinciding and each having no right to eminency. Therefore, to understand and to create are one and the same. Tradition is not an aggregate simply describing historical facts, but an absolutely living thing that is outside time and space. He who is able to reveal its secrets, changes not simply in the sense of broadening his knowledge, but is transformed within. Such an approach might be understood by believers, but not highbrowed and snobby professors with crooked mouths and short brains accustomed to believing poisonous doubt and selfish skepticism to be the scientific norm.

Germany’s scientific community ganged up on Herman Wirth. His ideas were regarded as extravagant and too radical. Essentially no objections were brought forth to seriously converse with this great erudite scholar, as all that was necessary was possessing qualities that opponents simply do not have. The main criticisms leveled concerned the “idealistic” approach and excessive trust which Wirth supposedly put in sacred sources. But today, after the research of Dumézil, Eliade, Lévi-Strauss, Kerényi, Jung, etc., scholars’ doubts back then seem to be completely unfounded. But the positivist approach still

dominated then. Nevertheless, Wirth paid little attention to the attacks by his colleagues and continued to explore the Nordic Tradition and ascertain the secret formula, knowledge of which, in his opinion is, like Archimedes' lever, capable of changing the world.

In studying the proto-language of humanity, Herman Wirth reached the astonishing conclusion that runic writing and especially the runic calendric circles discovered in Northern Europe are the remnants of Hyperborean proto-writing. They are not distorted Latin or a degenerate variant of the Mediterranean Phoenician alphabet. On the contrary, they are traces of the great symbolic circle out of which other historical alphabets developed much later, including the Phoenician one, which boasts no supremacy over other types of writing. But runes and their meaning can be understood only by accepting the hypothesis of the existence of the Polar Continent, Hyperborea, as their meaning, name, and distribution on calendric circles reveal their sense only in relation to the natural phenomenon that take place in the Arctic. Scholars have therefore been incapable of putting the pieces of this historical puzzle together and weave together the different details of archaeological and anthropological glimpses. Of course, primordial runes greatly differed from those known today. But they can be restored. In the thousands of pages he authored, Herman Wirth examined thousands of illustrations, ancient symbols, rock carvings, patterns on ancient household items, pottery, various tools, etc. All of this brings us closer to the much sought secret, the original runic circle.

The center of this circle is the winter solstice. The Great Yule is the main celebration of the Hyperborean Year. In it is the secret of the runes and the Primordial Tradition. In Hyperborea, Yule was celebrated on December 22nd. On December 22nd every year, the true New Year arrived, the moment of the birth of the runes, the moment of the Eternal Return, the second in which Hyperborea stood outside of time and space, pulled away from the cycles of the dark age, the confusion in the South, false theories, and miserable neglect of Supreme Magical Purity...Vara, Varahi, Ultima Thule...

Herman Wirth argued that the secrets of the runes were originally kept not by male priests, but priestesses. White Ladies. Weise Frau – Weisse Frau. The words “wisdom”, “woman,” and “white” are indeed closely related in many languages. Pallas is the Goddess of Wisdom, and the Sophia of the Gnostics is also an embodiment of knowledge and the feminine element in the Divine. The Russian word *mudrost'* (wisdom) is similar to the German *Made*, *Madchen* or *Maiden*, *Girl*. Hence the ancient cult of the vestal virgins, the keepers of the sacred fire in Rome. Here we should also include the practice of the female priesthood in the early Christian church, and the Old Believers' theory of “salvation through one's wife.” Following Bachofen, Herman Wirth claimed that the Primordial Tradition was none other than matriarchal. It was the realm of the White Lady, the Pure Virgin. The primordial Nordic Pantheon was headed by a Goddess – not female in our patriarchal understanding of a capricious, stupid, cruel, and demanding being – but as the special, Most Pure Creation, a kind of Androgyne standing beyond dualism, its spiritual intuition penetrating the essence of things. The Polar Paradise, the Aryan race, the

Primordial Tradition, the domination of the White Lady, the guardians of the runic cults and priestess of the dolmens and menhirs – for Wirth these are synonyms. Wirth thus insists on the primordial matriarchy of the polar Tradition.

In practice, this manifested itself in him professing a particular form of “Germanic Aryan Feminism.” The following picture of sacred archetypes in history is developed in Wirth’s work: Primordial matriarchy is deemed intrinsic to the northern peoples, the first bearers of culture. The other tribes of the earth received from them the foundations of cults, language, ritual, and myth. But as a result of mixing with the peoples of the South, the messengers of the North gradually lost Tradition’s proportions, forgot the meaning of the runes, and tweaked their religious-calendric rituals under new natural conditions. With this arose the new institute of priesthood in which the main role is henceforth played by men. The Germanic peoples, and especially the ancestors of the Dutch and the Frisians, were the last upholders of Aryan matriarchy, although other Indo-European peoples who adopted the practice of determining their identity through the mother’s line did belong to this category. These are the legendary Tuatha Dé Danann, the “tribes of the goddess Danu” from the Irish sagas, the Frisians as the “children of Freya”, etc. Gradually mixed cultural forms thus yielded patriarchy, which came to be perfected among Middle Eastern ethnai, especially the Semitic peoples.

Indo-European civilizations themselves came to be subjected to the influence of these new cults. The Ancient Hyperborean priestess institutions were abolished, demonized, or reduced to vestigial forms.

These ideas cost Herman Wirth very much. In the 1920’s, when he began presenting and widely promoting his Aryan-feminist views, he found himself an implacable enemy in the face of an immigrant from Russia’s Baltic lands, a certain Alfred Rosenberg who, on the contrary, believed patriarchy to be an indigenous Aryan institution. Unlike Wirth, Rosenberg was a pedant, a mediocrity, and aggressive plagiarist. But it was not even about his ideas...Herman Wirth was the archetype of a passionate scholar, a visionary, and seer. Rosenberg was a pathetic doctrinaire who regurgitated undigested fragments of knowledge and pretentiously arranged these scraps in his rash and meaningless book *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*. Unfortunately, it was this Baltic official embroiled in resentment who happened to determine the cultural police of the National Socialists who won in 1933. It is no wonder that afterwards the best intellectual and spiritual forces of the German Conservative Revolution – such people as Jung, Heidegger, Haeckel, and Wirth himself – were finally pushed into the opposition camp.

In 1932, German Wirth founded a society for the study of ancient cultures under the name *Ancestors’ Heritage*, or *Ahnenerbe*. In 1933, this organization came under the control of Heinrich Himmler, who was Rosenberg’s main opponent and rival among the Nazi leadership. For all this time, Herman Wirth

continued his intense research into elucidating the secrets of the origin of mankind, language, ancient cultures, and primordial cults. The Ahnenerbe organized unique expeditions to the North Sea where, Wirth presumed, the traces of the ancient civilizations of the Hyperboreans were supposed to remain – such as in Dogger Bank or Dogger Shallows, the lands flooded relatively recently, altogether some 12,000 years ago. According to Wirth's reconstruction, these are the lands of Ponseti or Forseti, Forsetiland, a remnant of the even more ancient continent of Mo-Uru. The expeditions acquired unique findings. In parallel, Wirth directed Schaeffer's expedition to Tibet to check his hypothesis on the preservation of remains of Hyperborean culture in the Gobi desert and Western Tibet, in the mountainous land of Shan, the homeland of the Bon religion.

The Ahnenerbe juxtaposed enormous amounts of archaeological, paleo-epigraphical, as well as ethnological and linguistic materials at the organization's disposal. Unique research unprecedented in scale and depth was carried out. Moreover, the majority of the Ahnenerbe's leaders did not at all share the official regime's totalitarianism and chauvinism. In the opinion of Wirth and his pupils, the descendants of the Hyperboreans, or pure Aryans, are currently among all of the earth's peoples regardless of skin color, and Europeans, including Germans, were not vested with any kind of superiority in this regard. All of this inevitably led Wirth into the opposition. Wirth's pupil and disciple, Wolfram Sievers and Friedrich Hielscher became the heads of an anti-Hitler conspiracy. They helped numerous persecuted people, including Jews, escape and relocate to safe places. Unsurprisingly, while head of the Ahnenerbe in 1938, Herman Wirth, not being a member of the National Socialist German Workers Party, was removed from his office and put under scrupulous surveillance by the Gestapo. His home was searched and many valuable artifacts were taken from his personal collection. His whole endeavor was thus ruined by conformists and idiots. Alas, this repeats itself constantly in history. One only has to demonstrate some kind of unique, lively, creative, fantastic, avant-garde initiative for thick, sullenly stupid, envious, and incompetent scum to grossly ruin the whole thing. Just as in science, thus it is in politics and art. The only true racism would be that directed against aggressive mediocrities and vain but swift empty heads, members of the ubiquitous "conspiracy of mediocrities", the secret order of those with average capabilities united to constantly and invariably destroy the glorious plans of heroes and geniuses.

And so, Herman Wirth fell into disgrace and came under supervision by the secret police. If not for the intervention of his friend and colleague, a sophisticated mystic and lover of antiquity, Walter Darré, Wirth would not have avoided a concentration camp. But what do you do? Alas, this is the dark age, the triumph of lies and dishonesty. Injustice is the law of the epoch when the wheel of Dharma flies off of its axis...

Herman Wirth explained everything, such as why there exists the custom of putting up a Christmas tree. It turns out that this is a very ancient ritual, in which the tree symbolizes the World Tree, whose origins

date back to the point of the winter solstice, the shortest day, and the crown at the top is the summer solstice, June 22nd. The months in a year are the branches and the ornaments are days. The spruce is the eternally green tree, in this respect similar to the Year or the biblical Burning Bush. The year moves, but remains the same just as pine needles do not change their color over the course of the year. The burning bush on Mount Sinai burns, but does not burn out. Wirth traces the Russian name for spruce, yel, back the ancient root *ii* or *ei*, referring to Light and the Divine as well as sacred artifacts symbolizing Light. The gifts placed under the Christmas tree are the New Year, the new world, fresh and full of new energy. There also exists the custom of stuffing boots or stockings with gifts. These are meant to not be matching. This symbolizes the fact that Time crosses the magical line of Yule with one foot, the winter solstice, while the other leg is left in the old year. The lights on the tree represent the sun at different stages of its yearly movement. For this very same reason, Ded Moroz's (or Santa Claus') red coat depicts a large, solar circle. Ded Moroz himself once represented a Light Deity, the Ancient-in-Days. Later his functions were taken over by Saint Nicholas the Wonderworker whose holiday is celebrated by the Church shortly before the winter solstice. Even the downward-slanted branches of the tree, according to Wirth, have symbolic meaning. This repeats the runic sign *Tiu*, the man with down-stretched hands. This symbolizes the half of the year over the course of which the polar sun descends downwards spirally to the dark regions of night. According to Wirth, *Tiu*, *Tyr*, and *Tuisto* are not simply the names of ancient deities in German paganism. After all, paganism was a perversion of the ancient proto-monotheism which came along with patriarchal usurpation. The Aryan ancestors never recognized the existence of separate, individualized deities. They worshipped the One World imbued with the presence of the One God whose signs of manifestation changed, unfolding in time and space, but while remaining essentially the same, the Self. Paganism arose out of the crisis of the primordial Nordic matriarchy. The White Lady, the Snow Queen, and our *Snegurochka* paradoxically turn out to be figures more ancient and more authentic than Ded Moroz. The True Mistress of the Great Yule, the winter solstice, is *die Weisse Frau*, *die Weise Frau*. She immaculately gives birth in this fantastic moment to the New Divine Eon, the New Year, the new God. It all fits together. It is no coincidence that Herman Wirth called the primordial Hyperborean tradition the somewhat strange combination of "polar Christianity".

The New Year. The Great Yule. The rune *tiu*, i.e., the man with down-stretched hands, descends to the roots of the World Tree. This is the point of death. This is the center of hell. And in the Christian tradition, Satan himself is distinguished by all the features of the symbolic complex describing the signs of the winter solstice. Satan and devils have tails and tridents. Have you ever wondered why? Because the trident pointed downwards is the rune *ig*, the clear sign of the roots of the World Tree. And this rune is found at the point of the winter solstice. Such is also the meaning of the Greek Neptune's trident.

The underworld in mythology is associated with being underwater, as in Lithuanian, in which *jura* means sea. The devils' tails complement their bipedalism up to the fullness of the sacred sign. In fact, Satan limps for the same reason that a stocking with gifts is put by the Christmas tree for children. And the devils' tridents, with which they actively stir their sinners in their cauldrons (which in themselves are

also symbols of Yule) finally complete the picture. They are black and live underground. The fire of hell is an infernal version of the Christmas Lights, etc. Thanks to Herman Wirth's formula, one can interpret all ancient and modern folklore and theology, the meaning of rites, and even the message of Nature. And this is embodied in the primordial Hyperborean language whose beginning was God. Gott ist Anfang jeglicher Sprache. Martin Heidegger argued something similar when he said that Poetry lies at the basis of language. According to Wirth, language is not an instrument for formulating messages and expressions, but is in itself the higher Message and most important Expression. But modern people are deaf to this reality. They crudely and in a utilitarian manner use what furnishes first decoding, consciousness, understanding and only then – in fact, then you don't want to tolerate and listen to all of this nonsense to which you've become so accustomed and which seems to us to be something familiar and obvious. But this is a propos; let us return again to the devils.

After all, it is known that on New Years night, the forces of hell rise up out of the ground to harass and frighten the two-legged. Everything that Gogol wrote is pure truth, and he even left out a lot that we would regret. And so, devils have horns. But why? Herman Wirth says that this is another rune, the rune ka, the man with raised hands and two upward-angled lines. These luminous horns are depicted on Moses' brow. Two raised hands are also an Egyptian hieroglyph denoting a resurrecting soul. And in Egyptian it sounds – don't be surprised – the same as the typical Icelandic rune ka. Thus, Death is tiu, and Resurrection is ka. The sacrificial descent into hell precedes the Great Yule, after which follows the victorious ascent. Before this magical point, God – the Light of the World – the Christmas Tree – Man – Priest – Priestess – the White Lady lower their hands. Tiu. Afterwards, their hands are lifted up. Ka or Kai. The birth of the new.

This is the meaning of initiation – transitioning from the old to the new, from the profane to the enlightened, from the mortal to the immortal, from the material to the spiritual. The Great Yule is the moment of initiation, dedication. Inside the heart, inside the small ventricle of the heart, in the cave, in a manger, in the place of the Brahma is born a new being, homo novus, Sonnenmensch.

Herman Wirth's work is the metaphysics of the New Year, the reconstruction of the New Language – the unified Language which was spoken before the dispersion of Babel. This is the Nordic glossolalia, systematized and explained. All Kabbalistic designs, not to mention the pathetic attempts of modern occultism, fade before such a picture. Wirth operates with realities much more ancient than the emergence of the Ancient Hebrew or Phoenician writing systems which are in official Mediterranean scholarship considered to be the most culturally ancient. Herman Wirth easily interprets the Bible, every one of its tales, all of its linguistic difficulties, every symbol, and every passage. All the theology of Leviticus collapses before our very eyes. The Old Testament is a detailed narrative of the primordial Tradition and the Hyperborean formula, but not the only and unique one. Rather, it is one equal among other mythological constructs such as Hinduism, Buddhism, Greek, Iranian, Slavic, and Germanic

mythologies, and the myths of the Indians, Malays, Africans, and peoples of Oceania. The ritual tattoos of the Maori peoples, the special initiatic language of their wisemen, and the West African alphabet of the Bamun script all suggest a divine reality that is just as clear (and perhaps even clearer) as the amazing and poetic passages of the Torah. In fact, Herman Wirth dedicated his enormous book of more than 1000 pages, *Palestinabuch*, to this subject. But, alas, no one, no matter how much they desire, can read it. In 1969, it was stolen from the old professor's home by unknown assailants. Someone really did not want this veritable interpretation of the Old Testament to exist, even in manuscript form.

In 1945, Herman Wirth, after seven years of Gestapo surveillance, was interned in a concentration camp. What was left of his collection by the Gestapo beasts was destroyed by the "civilized" Americans. For two years, Herman Wirth – a sworn enemy of narrow German chauvinism and a member of the anti-Hitler underground – went through tortuous and humiliating de-Nazification. But the victors were not interested in nuances. They were even less concerned about the spiritual proto-language of humanity, the Northern ancestral home, the pre-Babel language, and the secrets of the runes. One side of the winners was not interested in anything more than money and comfort, while the other half was completely absorbed in its own totalitarianism and Engels' illusory and rather simpleminded constructs. The very fact that Herman Wirth was a "Nordicist" and held to the theory of "cultural circles" (*Kulturkreise*), which was considered an indicator of "misanthropy", proved to be sufficient grounds to expunge his name from official scholarship along with Klages, Baeumler, Kossina, Teudt, Horbiger, and others. Wirth was still lucky, however, as his disciple and successor Wolfram Sievers – who was also a leading member of the underground involved in an assassination attempt on Hitler and preparing an assassination attempt on Himmler – was altogether executed as a result of the Nuremberg Trials. But in the era of the Winter Solstice, in the midst of the Polar Night, such an outcome is natural.

Heidegger said: "Modern people are so far removed from the light of Being that they are unaware that they live in darkness. In complete absence of Light, the darkness itself ceases to be darkness for sake of nothing for comparison." Wirth argued the same point, only he identified Light and Being with understanding the Divine Year, the source of language, thought, symbols, and spiritual teachings. Herman Wirth wrote:

The sacred meaning of the Year is completely unknown to modern, city-dwelling man. For him the year is only an abstract, temporal understanding in no way different from all other intervals of time along which modern "socio-economic" life operates. The year is known to him only on the calendar, in business records, and wardrobe changes. Modern urban man is no longer in step with the rhythm of creation. His encounter with the God Year in nature occurs only sporadically, during vacation or natural disasters. In order to return to the experience of the Year, modern man must "recover" from his civilized existence that is separated from the experience of being. As the pace of work and life is becoming faster, even the gap with the more human Year, with the cycle of man's Destiny-Life, is increasing. In

need of “recovering” are none other than those “social” people who, freed from all the natural laws of the God Year, turn night into day, and day into night, and make “optimal use of time” while they are in fact killing time. The God Year in nature refreshed men, but they can no longer find an inner path to it. If they understood its very meaning, they would have never set off in mad pursuit of Mammon, making money into a goal of life; they would have not started believing that senseless industrialization and the enlargement of cities is inevitable; and they would not be mired in such deep materialism that seals the poverty, weakness, and nothingness of their soul, the soul of ‘modern humanity.’ The main reason for all ills is modern men’s fall from the eternal rhythm of the God Year. They themselves do not live, but are lived by something extraneous, something alien. They rot in their bodies and souls and grow old even in youth.

Herman Wirth lived to a very old age and died in 1981. His whole life was struggle, selfless activism, and preparing Spiritual Revolution. Not long before his death, he said in an interview to a small regional German journal, Humus: “Mein Leben ist immer geistige Revolutions-Arbeit gewesen” (“My life has always been working towards Spiritual Revolution”). Like all heroes in dark times, on the external level he was met with defeat, but on the spiritual level with Triumph and Victory. The blacker the night, the closer are the rays of the Golden Dawn, Aurora Consurgens. Among us lived a man who revealed great secrets, the secret cyphers of the Past, a man who reconstructed in its entirety the language of the great Primordial Tradition, but who remains virtually unknown, unnoticed, misunderstood, and unread. Despite the fact that Julius Evola called Herman Wirth one of his three teachers (along with Guénon and Guido de Giorgio), and despite the fact that Guénon himself dedicated a most important review of the cycles and symbolism of human races to Wirth, Traditionalists to this day altogether ignore this great author. This is so strange that it even arouses suspicion. Are even the chosen ones in the shadows and shroud of cosmic midnight? Does their carelessness and desire to at any price hold on to imaginary orthodoxy not expose their own parody and fraud?

But Herman Wirth’s work has not been lost. The Light of the North beats in our hearts. The Snow Queen has taken our souls and enchanted them with the spells of polar dreams. There, in the Arctic night, in Arctogaia, we, under the initiatic name of Kai – the resurrected, risen, and belonging to the spring half of the Divine Year – piece together out of icicles the magic word, EWIGKEIT, the favorite word of the German professor, Herman Wirth.

Herman Wirth's Theory of Civilization

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The Cultural Circle of Thule

Bachofen's idea of a primordial matriarchy and his theory of "cultural circles" were developed by another historian and archaeologist, a specialist in paleo-epigraphy, Herman Wirth (1885-1981).

Wirth's theories are based on the hypothesis borrowed from the Indian author Bala Gandhara Tilak (1856-1920) [1], that the original Proto-Indo-European civilization was formed in the late Paleolithic (the Aurignacian culture) in the lands of the northern polar circle. This hypothesis was based on the interpretation of the data of Indian astrology, Vedic texts, and the myths of the Hindus, Iranians, and Greeks which speak of the existence in remote antiquity of a populated country lying in the Far North (Hyperborea). This continent was described in the Vedas as the "land of the white boar", Varahi, and the "island of light", or Sweta Dvipa. The Zoroastrian tradition speaks of the ancient abode of the first man, the city of Vara, located in the Far North, from which he was forced to descend southwards as the dark deity Angra Mainyu, the enemy of the god of light, Ahura-Mazda, unleashed a "great cold" across these lands. Tilak argues for the existence of this "Nordic" proto-civilization on the basis of Indian astrology, the symbolism of which, according to Tilak, becomes clear only if we accept that the constellations were originally observed in the circumpolar regions, where the day of the gods is equal to the year of men.

Wirth adopted this hypothesis and constructed his own theory upon it, the "Hyperborean theory" [2] or theory of the "cultural circle of Thule" [3], which represents the Greek name for the mythical city lying in the country of the Hyperboreans. According to this theory, before the latest wave of global cooling, the circumpolar zone in the North Atlantic Ocean was home to inhabitable lands whose inhabitants were the creators of a primordial cultural code. This culture was formed under conditions when the natural environment of the Arctic was not yet so harsh, and when its climate was similar to the modern temperate Central European climate. There were present all the annual and atmospheric phenomena which can be observed in the Arctic today: the Arctic day and Arctic night. The yearly solar and lunar cycles of the Arctic are structured differently than their counterparts in middle-range latitudes. Thus, the symbolic fixations of the calendar, the trajectory of the sun, the moon, and the constellations of the zodiac necessarily had a different form and different patterns.

On the basis of an enormous swathe of archaeological, paleo-epigraphical (cave paintings, Paleolithic symbols, ancient carvings, etc.), mythological, and philological material, Herman Wirth undertook an attempt to reconstruct the primordial system of this Arctic proto-civilization's cultural code. At its heart he put the reconstructed proto-calendar, the last traces of which Wirth believed are constituted by the Scandinavian runes, which he attributed to remote antiquity. Wirth proposed to examine this calendar, which records the key moments of the Arctic year, as the key to all later versions of mythological, religious, ritualistic, artistic, and philosophical heritages which continued and developed this primordial algorithm over the course of the wave-like migrations of the bearers of "Thulean culture" into the southern regions. When applied to other climatic conditions, however, many of the symbolic patterns of this calendar, otherwise crystal clear in the Arctic, lost their meaning and rationale. They were partially transferred to new realities, partially frozen as relics, and partially lost their meanings or acquired new ones.

First and foremost, this change entailed a fundamentally new understanding of the basic unit of time: instead of the Hyperborean day, equal to a year, the daily circle, which is much more clearly defined in the regions south of the polar circle, became the measure of events of human life. What is more, the localizing points of the spring and autumn equinoxes changed in relation to southward movement. All of this gradually confused the crystal clarity and simplicity of the primordial matrix.

Wirth believed that his reconstruction of the sacred complex of the culture of Thule lay at the heart of all historical types of writing and language, as well as musical tones, the symbolism of colors, ritual gestures, burials, religious complexes, etc.

Studying this culture formed the basis of Wirth's attempts at reconstructing what he called the "proto-writing" or "proto-script" of humanity. Wirth published the results of his studies in two monumental works, *Der Ausgang der Menschheit* (The Emergence of Mankind) [4] and *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit* (The Sacred Proto-Script of Mankind) [5], both equipped with an enormous lot of synoptic tables, comparative illustrations of archaeological excavations, writing systems, etc.

Nordic matriarchy

Wirth embraced Bachofen's notion of primordial matriarchy and attributed to the "Thule culture" a matriarchal form of civilization. He suggested that the belief that the female gender is inclined towards

materiality, corporeality, chthonicity, and empirical specifics is purely a product of patriarchal censorship, and that matriarchy could be no less, indeed even more of a spiritual phenomenon than patriarchy. Wirth believed that societies dominated by women and female priesthoods, religions, and cults represented the more advanced types of Hyperborean culture, which he termed the “culture of White Ladies” (weisse Frauen).

Wirth thus presented an altogether peculiar view on the relationship between matriarchy and patriarchy in the archaic culture of the Mediterranean region. In his point of view, the most ancient forms of culture in the Mediterranean were those established by bearers of the Hyperborean matriarchy, who in several stages descended from the circumpolar regions, from the North Atlantic, by sea (and that ships with shamrocks on the stern were characteristic of them). These were the people mentioned in ancient Near Eastern artifacts as the “sea-peoples”, or am-uru, hence the ethnic name of the Amorites. The name Mo-uru, according to Wirth, once belonged to the very main center of the Hyperboreans, but was transmitted along with the natives of the North in their migration waves to new sacred centers. It is to these waves that we owe the Sumerian, Akkadian, Egyptian (whose pre-dynastic writing was linear), Hittite-Hurrian, Minoan, Mycenaean, and Pelasgian cultures. All of these Hyperborean strata were structured around the figure of the White Priestess.

Patriarchy, according to Wirth, was brought by immigrants from Asia, from the steppe zones of Turan, who distorted the primordial Hyperborean tradition and imposed upon the Mediterranean cultures quite different – rude, violent, aggressive, and utilitarian -values which contrasted (for worse) the pure spiritual forms of the Nordic matriarchy.

Thus, in Wirth we have the following reconstruction: the Hyperborean cultural circle’s primordial, spiritual and highly-developed type of matriarchal culture spread from a circumpolar center, mainly by sea, penetrating the Mediterranean, scraping Africa, and even reaching the southern coast of Asia all the way down to Polynesia, where the Maori culture still retains traces of the ancient Arctic tradition. Another offshoot of the center of Mo-uru in the North Atlantic migrated to North America, where it laid the foundations of the cultural code of many tribes. One of Wirth’s undertakings was to demonstrate a homology between these two branches that dispersed out of the culture of Thule – the European, Mediterranean, and further African and Pacific on the one hand, and the North-American on the other.[6]

Meanwhile, in continental Asia there formed a cultural pole which represented the embryo of proto-patriarchy. Wirth associated this culture with crude naturalism, phallic cults, and a martial, aggressive,

and utilitarian type of culture, which Wirth believed to be lower and Asian. We have devoted a whole separate volume to a more detailed outline of Herman Wirth's views.[7]

The significance of Wirth's ideas to geosophy

Many aspects of Herman Wirth's unjustly forgotten works deserve attention in the study of plural anthropology. First of all, his extremely fertile hypothesis of the cultural circle of Thule, which is usually discarded from the outset without any careful analysis of his argumentation, is so rich that it deserves serious attention in itself. If such an hypothesis allows for the resolution of such numerous historical and archaeological problems associated with the history of symbols, signs, myths, rituals, hieroglyphs, the calendar, writing, and the most ancient views of the structure of space and time, then this alone is enough to warrant thorough inquiry. Even though Wirth's works contain many claims which seem either unequivocally wrong or highly controversial, we can set them aside and try to understand the essence of his theory which, in our opinion, is an extraordinarily constructive version that expands our understanding of the archaic epochs of the ancient history of mankind. The theory of the cultural circle of Thule need not be unconditionally accepted, but an assessment of its interpretive potential is necessary.

Secondly, Wirth's positive appraisal of matriarchy is extremely interesting and adds weight to sympathy for Bachofen. Indeed, we are dealing with an interpretation of a conditionally reconstructed matriarchal civilization from the position of what is the, in the very least nominal, patriarchy to which our society has become accustomed. Wirth proposes an alternative interpretation of the female Logos, an attempt to view the Logos of the Great Mother through different eyes. This is also an extremely unconventional and fertile proposal.

Thirdly, in Wirth's theories we can see clear analogues to the reconstructions of both Spengler and Frobenius. If Frobenius and especially Spengler took the side of Indo-European (Turanian, Eurasian) culture, i.e., the side of patriarchy as they interpreted it, then Wirth proposes to look at things from the standpoint of the civilization of the White Ladies, i.e., from the position of the primordial Mediterranean culture that preceded the invasion of the "people on war chariots."

Footnotes:

[1] Tilak, B.G., *Arkticheskaiia rodina v Vedakh* (Moscow: FAIR-PRESS, 2001). In English: Tilak, B.G., *The Arctic Home in the Vedas: Being Also a New Key to the Interpretation of Many Vedic Texts and Legends* (Poona City: Tilak Bros, 1903).

[2] Dugin, A.G., *Znaki Velikogo Norda: Giperboreiskaiia Teoriia* (Moscow: Veche, 2008). English translation of introduction available [here](#).

[3] Wirth, H., *Khronika Ura-Linda. Drevneishaiia istoriia Evropy* (Moscow: Veche, 2007). In German: Wirth, Herman. *Die Ura-Linda Chronik* (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1933).

[4] Wirth, H., *Der Aufgang der Menschheit. Forschungen zur Geschichte der Religion, Symbolik und Schrift der atlantisch-nordischen Rasse* (Jena: Diederichs, 1928).

[5] Wirth, H., *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit. Symbolgeschichtliche Untersuchungen diesseits und jenseits des Nordatlantik* (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang, 1936).

[6] The full title of Wirth's *Die Heilige Urschrift der Menschheit* specifies "on both sides of the North Atlantic." See footnote 5.

[7] See footnote 2.

Chapter 22 of Part 2, "Theories of Civilizations: Criteria, Concepts, and Correspondences", of *Noomachy: Wars of the Mind – Geosophy – Horizons and Civilizations* (Moscow, Akademicheskii Proekt, 2017).

Translator: Jafe Arnold

HOW THE WORLD OF THINGS WILL REPLACE THE WORLD OF PEOPLE (ON SPECULATIVE REALISM)

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Today we will be discussing contemporary philosophy. In particular, speculative realism and object-oriented ontology. In my opinion, this is a very relevant topic.

I can admit that I have previously not entirely correctly interpreted speculative realism, beginning with Quentin Meillassoux. It seemed to me that his defense of new materialism, his struggle of the subject against the subject, his apologism for contingency, his proposal to in the framework of the philosophy of the Copernican Revolution to displace the subject from central positions into the periphery, in this there is something archaic, harkening back to 19th century materialism, non-critical positivism, plus his critique of Deleuze, whom he reproached for various "vitalisms."

To be honest, all of this left me with the rather impetuous impression that we are dealing with a kind of "correction" of post-modernity with a more archaic, less critical view of intellectually imperfect materialism, a realism of past epochs.

I can say that this was a mistake. I did not understand Quentin Meillassoux correctly. I think that philosophy is such a thing for which we need to recognize our mistakes, or else lose any trust in ourselves.

In other words, it seemed to me that all phenomenology, all of Heideggerianism, Husserl and structuralism, including of the post-modern type - all of this was ignored by speculative realists, and I was not at all correct on this.

In fact, upon becoming better acquainted with their ideas, I have understood that they are not so naive, anachronous personages frightened by post-modernity, like Habermas. Habermas is an example of the backwards philosopher, who upon encountering post-modernity, saw that the spirit of the Enlightenment is in danger and started to swing in all directions in order to try to defend modernity.

I thought of speculative realism in this same spirit as some kind of “archaic modernity”, but in fact this is not the case.

Graham Harman puts everything into its place, because his path towards object-oriented ontology proceeds from Heidegger, corresponding to phenomenology, which is not ruled out, but is included in speculative realism. Speculative realism is not some kind of backsliding to modernity, but is the most genuine post-modernity. It is a continuation of post-modernity, its deepening, it is a move into the depth of post-modernity - a most avant-garde one, I would say.

In my opinion, this is serious - this moving into the depths of post-modernity, or continuing it in some sense, or the honing of its strategy. This is really relevant and everything falls into place.

As follows, when in object-oriented ontology the point is the rehabilitation or apologia of the object, the aspiration to liberate the object from the subject, the point is not a kind of pre-phenomenological realism, nor positivism or materialism, but a post-phenomenology. And this is a whole different matter.

Harman, proceeding from Heidegger, defines the object as *Zuhandensein*, i.e., as something “handy” or “ready-to-hand”, “handiness.”

In essence, this is an object in the sense of the Heideggerian model as an existential of the *Dasein*, as a *Gestalt* of *Dasein*, or if we employ the methodology of Husserl, is the *noema*, that which exists in the process of the intentional act. Thus, this is not any pre-phenomenological, naive, object in the likes of the one with which the materialists operated in the 19th century or even the 20th century. This is a more nuanced object.

Harman and others working with object-oriented ontology understand that when we speak about the object, we are speaking about some kind of field within *Dasein*, within the intentional act. Thus, the object at first glance is essentially a projection of our subjectivity.

But what subjectivity? This is Not Kantian subjectivity, the subjectivity of old, pre-phenomenology, but the new, Heideggerian subjectivity which includes the critique of subject as such. Heidegger's

destruction leads to a kind of disruption of the status of the classical subjectivity, the so-called "Platonic", and builds a new view of the thinking presence, Dasein, and on this basis deconstructs traditional metaphysics.

As follows, the subjectivity with which object-oriented ontology deals already implies Dasein, i.e., the Heideggerian thinking presence which defines the world and objects as existentials. This is the object of basic existential experience. It all starts from here.

Thus, the object is not the hallucination of the classical subject, some kind of concept as in Hegel, a mental construct inscribed into the external world, but this object is some kind of basic existential experience, existential.

In order to substantiate the autonomy of the object and liquidate the subject, Harman liquidates not the subject, but Dasein. Recognizing that the object exists as an existential of Dasein, he says "Great, let's exclude this Dasein and commit to epoché with regards to Dasein". This is an interesting proposal. And he says "let's liberate the thing as a tool, as an instrument, noema, as something "handy", Zuhandensein - let's liberate it from the Dasein and preserve some kind of structure of its phenomenological description."

But how can this be done?

To do so, it's necessary to twist intentionality inside out. Not replace the object with Dasein, but to extinguish Dasein, the human, the thinking to such an extent that the phenomenological element of this thinking acquires independent significance. The instrument is lived in and by itself, not by strengthening its life but by weakening the life of Dasein.

The creation of object-oriented ontology, the transition to the world of things - which is needed for artificial intelligence, post-humanist philosophy, "silicon thinking", Silicon Valley, silicon botox medicine, and so on - all of this replaces human consciousness and body as an instrument with prosthetics, with mechanical substitutes.

Thus, properly speaking, object-oriented ontology strives to create substitutes for consciousness.

Hence David Chalmers' formula "the hard problem of consciousness", which in my opinion loses the status of so-called official philosophy. As they say, the globalists are everywhere, and this "hard problem of consciousness" is ubiquitously promoted by such special foundations. This is the grave of philosophizing. Thus, it begins with analytical philosophy and ends philosophy as such. Those who pose the "hard problem of consciousness" are already, so to speak, written out of so-called "normal philosophy" and are on the path to that of silicon brains. This is already half way to [treating humans as] meat and to the final post-humanism. This means the institutional extinguishing of philosophy.

Normally, analytical philosophy is engaged in by institutions, while object-oriented ontology and speculative realism are the work of more avant-garde, marginal, extra-institutional figures, who are more promoted on this path and have gone ever further, are even more delusional - so to say, more fun, more 'correct', but more delusional.

Both Chalmers with his "hard problem of consciousness" and especially Harman try to metaphysically substantiate this, accepting that this is indeed a complex problem, but arguing that its complexity is between material structures, brain tissues, and material thinking wherever such might exist, and that in fact it's simply necessary to thin the mechanical analysis of the process of thinking through a completely new philosophical course - to solve the hard problem of consciousness by means of destroying consciousness. If there is no consciousness, then there is no problem of consciousness. Their aim is not to show how this "non-material, subjective presence" is born out of material, but to show what the case will be when there is no such consciousness whatsoever. How will the brain function if it lives, but does not think? It lives its life but does not produce thoughts. This is what analytical philosophy leads to, gradually towards the extinguishing of philosophical alertness.

Object-oriented philosophers make this into a program aimed at extinguishing human thinking and to see what there will be, how a brain will think without consciousness. Thus, the "hard problem of consciousness" is solved through the annulment of consciousness and then, as they see it, we will understand everything as it is - how the human brain, and then non-human brain, can exist once consciousness is solved. The hard question of consciousness is liquidated through the liquidation of consciousness.

This is approximately the trajectory of Harman. He proposes to turn phenomenology inside out with regards to the object, but without attributing to the object the qualities of the subject. This is very important.

If one simply extinguishes the Dasein, then the very noema relating to the surrounding, as a so-to-speak conditional object, will be transformed, mutated. The less that Dasein is projected onto *Zuhandensein*, onto the tool, onto its own views, then this handiness, *Zuhandensein* will be conceived not from the point of view of the hand which wants to grab something, e.g., a hammer or any article. We see the latter as created for the hand to hammer in nails. The hammer does not have its own being besides as a handy instrument - the very word "handle" refers to the "hand". It is an object, a tool.

But Harman proposes to consider things thusly: we agree to the handle, but not with the hand that takes it. Imagine a hammer handle separated from the hand which takes it. Then the handle would bear a different name - it is a handle only because it is handy and in hand as an instrument. But if we say that the worker, the toiler who has artfully over the course of human history hammered nails, is dead and is no more, then what would the hammer be? What is the fate of the hammer if the worker who uses it no longer exists? In this case, the hammer will sooner or latter, in Harman's view, live its own life. First, it will see that it consists of two parts - a handle which no one will ever again take and which can peacefully grow into a planer, the working desk onto which it's been left. Or, conversely, its metal part long out of use can be welded if it touches other metals. It can be taken up by wind, it can pour sand, and so on. It can bask in nuclear waste when humanity destroys itself in nuclear war. The fate of this hammer, of this article, will continue in one way or another.

Subsequently, gradually there is the eversion inside out of all the existentials which are connected to this object. Thus begins the movement within this object, which is ensured by the reality of the extinguishing of Dasein - its consciousness, its subjectivization.

This is the phenomenological, Heideggerian foundation of object-oriented ontology: the object continues to be a constituted subject. Not the strong, hard subject which wields it - and this is where Deleuze's proposal comes in - the paranoid subject which reinforces itself and dissects others, but one which begins to dissolve itself and becomes schizophrenic. This "subject", according to Deleuze and Guattari, dissipates itself into schizo-masses. With this gradual self-denial, self-splitting, this kind of metaphysical suicide, Dasein begins to endow objects with its own decomposition which enlivens these objects. For instance, in David Lynch's films, such as in the *Twin Peaks* series, the character speaks with his own leg. When the character gets lost in the woods, he suddenly starts to speak to his own leg, which responds with its own voice. In other words, the leg, a subordinate, mute, obedient thing, a slave to the human brain, suddenly demonstrates the qualities of autonomy, has its own preferences as to where to go, can be angry, and so on. This is, as object-oriented ontologists say, a kind of "parliament organs", a "parliament of things" or...as Bruno Latour says the new ontologies of the creation of hybrids between subjects and objects. The talking leg is one example of the constitution of independent objects.

Thus, the object of object-oriented ontology becomes a reality, the object acquires independence significance from the subject insofar as the subject is abolished. And this object itself will be extinguished.

The subject is not so much “done away with” as it is abandoned. In this case, the subject is understood not as a pre-phenomenological subject, but post-phenomenological, Dasein.

In other words, object-oriented ontology boils down to the process of the abolition of Dasein. This is a process. If we say that we shall abolish Dasein and that then we’ll have the object of object-oriented ontology, this is incorrect. If we abolish Dasein, then we do not have object-oriented ontology and we don’t have any objects. Rather, objects live and gain strength as vampiric black holes in reality or in virtuality which absorb the life not of the falling, dying Dasein, but through some kind of necrosis. This is the ontology of necrosis, the gradual onset of living tissues within a dead body. This process is what object-oriented ontology wants to fixate.

This introduction to speculative realism might be more penetrating, at least for me, insofar as previously I did not entirely correctly that this is the case.

I have discovered a new author, Reza Negarestani, who goes even further in this direction and topicalizes necrosis to the point of beginning to speak of the post-human, infernal beings which will come into the world amidst the process of the enlivening of objects and the living incarnation of object-oriented ontology. I will talk about Reza Negarestani in the next episode of “Dugin’s Expertise.”

Translation of Jafe Arnold

4pt

Introduciton to Noomakhia (lecture 5) Logos of Dionysos

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Now, in the geosophy perspective, we understand better what the Logos of Apollo and the Logos of Cybele mean in the concrete sense and in the sense of the cultures and existential horizons. So now we are going to speak about, not in the general sense, the Logos of Dionysus, but in the concrete ethno-sociological, historical, sociological, and economical sense. We have fixed the very important moment in European history that defined the main structure of European Noomahia, European historical sequence of the events. The key to interpret European history in its ontological and existential dimension is to follow and observe how this process of Noomahia or how this interaction between two opposite existential horizons developed itself through the historical epochs and eras and cycles. We already have a kind of grilles de lecture reading system of interpretation, hermeneutic of European history, because as we have seen, it is based on the mutual reinterpretation of the same symbolic and mythological structures, religious structures, and cultural structures from two contrary perspectives. That is Noomahia in the purest sense. The Logos of Cybele tries to reinterpret the same figure or impose its own figure in the context of the mixed civilization. And that is a kind of fight for the gender of the deity, of the divinity, because divinity could be interpreted in the materialistic Cybelian perspective or spiritualistic and patriarchal, heavenly, vertical, Indo-European (in its original sense) way.

We have a kind of intersection or battlefield of European history between two Logos, which demands an encounter, a meeting point between two existential spaces. And this battlefield creates a kind of new structure, a third structure, because in the purest sense, the Logos of Apollo is represented by Turanian nomadic society. In its purest sense the Logos of Cybele is represented by agrarian, matriarchal, sedentary society. But there is a new dimension that is created that is precisely the field or space of Dionysus, where the patriarchal concept of the man is descending into the depth of the matter. That which belongs to the sky comes to the earth and comes into the center of the earth, to the center of underground. Dionysus became a king of Hell as Zagreus in the Greek myth. So there is a kind of differentiation of this Apollonian structure. The pure Apollo has no direct contact with the matter of the Logos of Cybele. He stays outside absolutely untouched. He belongs to the sky, to the day, to the light. He has no contact. He is pure. Apollo's order is the order of the father, of the purity, of the Logos, of the logical, and of the metaphysical strictness. There is the law of Heaven, of Platonic ideas, of the light, of the stars. But when the sun of the sky comes to the earth, that begins a new dimension and this dimension is the dimension or level of the Dionysus. There is a completely new field of reality. A new Logos is appearing. It could be regarded as a kind of result of the encounter, meeting, or the

battleground between two Logos but little by little it could be as well regarded as something autonomous that is not the product of the encounter of two opposite Logos but the third Logos as such.

We see that not in the European history but we see that in other cultures. For example; in Chinese culture or in the Pygmies in Africa. Chinese and Pygmies have the Dionysian society in the purest sense, and not as a result of a superposition of two existential horizons, but something original and autonomous. We should preserve in this Logos. Why are we speaking about three Logos and not about two? Because there is possibility in some societies, (not in the Indo-European sedentary or nomadic) but in other societies, we have the structures based fully on the absolute domination on this Dionysian Logos. But in the case of Indo-European culture, there is always a battlefield. Dionysus is a battlefield. (In other societies, not necessarily.) We need to take that into account in order to better understand what the Logos of Dionysus is. But in the Indo-European society, we are dealing precisely with the war between the Logos of Apollo and the Logos of Cybele. In the ethno-sociological sense, it is translated by the fundamental events and processes that were developing in the field of the third Indo-European function where there was a synthesis between third function (pastoralists), cattlers function of the Turanian pure Indo-European existential horizon and sedentary agricultural matriarchal society. In this segment of the society, in the European peasantry was the special space of the Dionysus. There is the field and the kingdom of Dionysus. It is the kingdom of the agriculture. Dionysus is the God of agriculture and the God of wine but is as well the God of the sacrifice of the bull and the cow. And in the mysteries and above all in the Eleusinian mysteries, he is always accompanied by Demeter, the new figure. Dionysus and Demeter are both the deities and the figures of agriculture. And that is a very important pair and very important duality between Dionysus and Demeter who play central roles in the Eleusinian mysteries. Eleusinian mystery was the mystery of the wine and the bread; wine grape represented by Dionysus and the sprout of the wheat represented by Demeter. This pair of the mother and heavenly son and patriarchal seed not created from her but put in her, in the center of the earth, in order to resurrect, in order to be revived, in order to come back. That was completely new version of agriculture, patriarchal understanding of agriculture.

Demeter is not the same as Cybele. It is a completely different understanding of what mother earth is. That is the concept of the patriarchal interpretation of mother earth. It is the mother earth that is seen from above and not from inner side. It is ephichthonic and not epochtonic deity. Epicthonic is above the surface of the earth. That is the field. Demeter is the mother of fields labored, prepared and directed to the sky, open to the sky, and open to the influences of the sky. That is the figure of the great mother recognizing transcendentality, the transcendent principle of heaven and the father. And it is submitted and domesticated mother. It is the mother in the patriarchal sense, embedded in the patriarchal society and accepted under such conditions precisely as agriculture. There is the shift from Cybele to Demeter. It is the very important shift. It is the shift from savage mother and domesticated mother. The mother creating autonomously the world and mother as helper to the father's seed to grow. That is different concept of the feminine principle of woman that is here intact. Dionysus is pair; he is son and he is lover

and he is husband. He as well is father of Demeter. It is completely new relations. And here we see in that pair in Eleusis mysteries of Greece, of the Thracian region (and I will explain why Thracian region is so important and Thracian partly covered Serbian territory) that is a mystery of the shift from purely Cybelian existential space in the peasantry into the patriarchal Demeteric space of the mixed Indo-European agrarian society. And there appears Dionysus as completely new figure. It is not Apollo but it is not Attis from Cybelian cycle. It is new figure of immanent transcendence - something that is coming from the sky in order to go to the center of the earth and after that save the earth from its chaotic or gravity or this Cybealin aspect. This is purification of the earth by the wine. The mystery of wine is kind of like the mystery of blood of God that has descended into the center of the earth in order to save the world, the matter itself.

The wine is Dionysus as a kind of freedom from the Great Mother. The freedom is possible and Dionysus is the sign of the freedom. Return is possible. The freedom is possible. The flight is possible. We could die but we should arise with Dionysus. So that is very important transcendental dimension installed in the context of the agrarian sedentary matriarchal society or existential horizon. There is very important aspect in the cycle of the myths and rites around Dionysus. There were Bacchae groups of women, followers of Dionysus. There was a moment when the Bacchea heard the call of Dionysus. That was a kind of silent voice that only initiated Bacchae women could hear. And that was a kind of call to go to the mountains. And the Bacchae, hearing the call of Dionysus, became mad and crazy and went through the fields and forests as crazy, tearing apart everything they encountered on their way, in order to get to the cave of Dionysus because that was the call that Dionysus is alive. And this crazy state of mind was very similar to the matriarchal orgy but with a very important difference. That was the appearance of the transcendental male figure. That was the profound feeling of the existence or the arrival of the savior (male savior). That was not autonomous creation of female androgyne (Agyditis) as in the cycle of Cybele. That was a kind of appearance of transcendental seed that was not a part of the great mother. That was female madness encountering with the real transcendental male figure, completely different from the previous orgiastic tradition. And that encounter with this transcendental vertical aspect was the essence of this call of Dionysus.

It is very interesting that in Indo-European tradition, we never see Dionysus in the pure state. It is always Dionysus as brother of Apollo, as bearer of light. So we interpret the figure of Dionysus and Logos of Dionysus in the Apollonian perspective. We have no other Dionysus. There is only one Dionysus in our tradition. It is Dionysus of the Indo-European existential horizon. But there is always possibility to re-interpret this figure in the perspective of Cybele. Cybele tries to regard this coming of the male figure, of the transcendental patriarchal figure, in its ancient matriarchal Cybelian perspective, and to replace the Dionysus by Adonis. Adonis was the figure of the matriarchal cycle, by Attis. And that slight change of the meaning turned everything upside down. That is why Dionysus was and is battlefield between two Logos in Indo-European context. Indo-European reading of Dionysus was Apollonian but they operated in a very dangerous space where the power of the Great Mother and its interpretations and its

hermeneutics was very very strong. And that is as well one of the reasons why there were no special rites and myths dedicated exclusively to Dionysus. And the majority of the rites, processions, myths, figures of Dionysus were taken from the special worship practices of Great Mother. That is fully described in two books that I suggest to you to read. The book of Carl Kerényi; *Dionysus; Archetypal Image of Indestructible Life*, and *Dionysian and Pre-Dionysian* (that is Vyacheslav Ivanov, in Russian Language.) When Carl Kerényi (Hungarian author and friend of Mircea Eliade, a very interesting and profound author) tried to reveal the sources of the cult of Dionysus, he came to the conclusion that there was before the figure of Dionysus something very near and very close to him but in completely different context. That was purely matriarchal cult with almost the same processions, almost the same rites of the cave, of the Bacchae, of the madness, of the orgies, but totally matriarchal. That is the most important and most interesting point. In the field of the rites, the cults, the legends, the myths of Dionysus in their origins were matriarchal traditions, transformed by coming of new Indo-European existential horizon.

The cult of Dionysus and Logos of Dionysus was the Logos, structure, and cult of Great Mother transformed by the descent of the transcendental patriarchal principle. So all the symbols of Dionysus were pre-Dionysian and matriarchal. Sometimes he appeared as the serpent. Sometimes he appeared surrounded by the figures of the half-man satyrs, half beasts. They were normally partners of the Great Mother. And these processions of Dionysus were as well continuations of the processions of the Great Mother, with the same rites, with the symbolism; the symbolism of Paeon linked with Dionysus was the symbolism of the Great Mother as well. That is interesting that that was a kind of conquest of the territory of the myth by Indo-Europeans. It was conquest and inner semantical transformation. The Indo-Europeans have conquered not only the physical space or villages or peoples. They conquered the space of myth. They conquered as well, worship practices. And they transformed semantically the figure of Cybele surrounded by all the symbols and all the signs and all the practices and worship and the cult into the figure of Demeter and Dionysus. This transformation was as well a kind of conquest. Indo-Europeans were conquerors that have appropriated the space that didn't belong to them because in the Turanian way of life they didn't know such things. They had taken that and conquered that and had imposed their reading. That was a kind of attack on the new field by Indo-European civilization.

In the metaphysical sense, in the neoplatonist tradition, Dionysus was presented as a mind. The main myth of Dionysus was the myth how the titans had turned Dionysus apart. The little child Dionysus playing on Olympus was attacked and turned apart and eaten by titans to win Olympus, in order to kill Dionysus. Neoplatonic interpretation of Dionysus is a mind that is present in any human but as a kind of spark of Dionysus. Because in Orphic interpretation, in neoplatonic interpretation of human nature, human nature is double. On one side, it is Titanic by the body and by the material aspect, and on the other side, it is Dionysian. And that is human soul and human mind. Human thought is Dionysian. Dionysus is turned apart as a spiritual intellectual principle presented in the multitudes but being unified, unique in its core. That is the concept of immanent intellect. Not the paradigm of intellect in the

father. But that is a kind of son of God present in the human nature and opposite to the other side of this nature that is titanic. This is precisely the problem of metaphysics of Dionysus and the metaphysics of human culture. It is double (human culture) because it consists from two horizons. There is titanic horizon that is not the body as such and not the matter but is the Cybelian reading of what is body. That is Noomahia. Dionysus is the man. Dionysus is the other name for the human being as cultural being in the context of superposition of two existential horizons. So that is the problem of all Indo-European society - the problem of Dionysus. Dionysus as battlefield between the patriarchy and matriarchy embedded in our culture. That is precisely the problem of Dionysus. It is the problem of Indo-European culture and it is key to Noomahia of Indo-European society, in Western Europe or in Asia. Because in Iran and India, there is exactly the same structure of the cultural problem. There is no such figure as Dionysus in Indian culture but there is Shiva, a paradoxical figure. And there is no direct equivalence but there is always this battlefield between two Logos.

And what is interesting is that in Indo-European societies, this Logos of Dionysus is unstable. There are the other cultures I have mentioned already (Chinese and Pygmy and maybe up to a certain point the culture of Aztecs in the new world [in America, South America, Central America] with Quetzalcoatl figure which is more or less a combined figure, a winged serpent). But in Indo-European society, the figure of Dionysus and field of Dionysus is unstable because it is very antagonistic and conflictual. There is the conflict between mind and body, not because of the nature of mind and body but because of the reading of the nature of mind and body. Mind as we consider it is something that belongs to Logos of Apollo and its immanent representation in Dionysus. And our body is read (not is the part of the Logos of Cybele) as something material, something with gravity. That is not necessary. There are other cultures that have completely different concept of body with no materiality inside. But our Indo-European problem, with the weight of the body, of the materiality of body is the trace of the Logos of Cybele and not the objective nature of the body. Everything we are dealing with are the projections of this paradigm. So the existential horizon of Cybele dictates the quality of our body, of something that is gravity, that is a limitation of the soul. It is not natural. It is cultural construction (our concept of mind, body so on). But what is important is that the figure of Dionysus in our cultures is unstable. The center of the Logos of Dionysus is always shifted. Or to the Apollonian Logos that is the normal situation. So we don't know Dionysus as such. Indo-Europeans know Dionysus in Apollonian perspective as the brother of Apollo, not as such. So the center of Dionysian understanding of the world is shifted to the top. It belongs to the Apollonian universe that dominates in Indo-European cultures. So the Logos of Dionysus is normally a kind of continuation or immanent dimension of the Logos of Apollo. That is a classical or normative case of Indo-European civilization.

In order to understand better what is Cybele, we could not compare that with something material, for example the waves or frequencies. We are dealing with Logos. We are not dealing with the same matter with different gravity or different density. We are dealing with completely different understanding of everything. So we could not regard the Cybele as something that is outside of us, as object or matter or

vibrations or frequencies or beauty or darkness. Cybele is a kind of vision of the world. For example, if we are speaking about matter or elements, we could suggest three readings of that. So the main idea of Noology is the Logos of Cybele, Logos of Dionysus, and Logos of Apollo are deep inside of any form of thought. They are inside of thought and not in front of thought. They are the paradigms that are very difficult to grasp, to seize, and to understand because they are dealing behind our mind, defining its structure. We could not see Cybele as image that is in front of us (or Apollo or Dionysus). When we are speaking about the Logos, we are speaking about something that is deep behind our fluid of consciousness that defines the roots of our mentality. We could not speak about the pure or impure, of high frequency or low frequency. Just because it is not the matter, it is not the wave; we could not put it in front of us.

But in order to proceed with Logos of Dionysus, we need to understand the problematic nature of Dionysus in our culture. It is not the universal law or rule in our culture. It is shift to the top. It is not pure Logos of Dionysus. It is Apollonian Dionysian Logos we are dealing with. But being the battlefield and being precisely the intermediary space, there is always the possibility of opposite reading. Through the books and through studies of Noomahia in my books, I have discovered that that is maybe the main metaphysical problem of all Indo-European cultures in history. That is a kind of structure or moment or sequence of Noomahia. It is a key to our historical being. As historical beings, that is the key to understand what we are and what is our history. Because there was always the effort of something inside us to put this center of the Logos of Dionysus to the other direction and regard it as something that lays beneath this line that separates and distinguishes Logos of Apollo and Logos of Cybele. I am calling that (a kind of presumption) black double of Dionysus, or Adonis, or Attis. That is not as Dionysus as we know in our normative Indo-European tradition but a kind of product of Cybelian re-interpretation of Dionysus. And that is precisely the titan, the figure of Lucifer, or the titan of Prometheus, or someone that is very very close to Dionysus. We could consider that but it is kind of his black double. There is German word, 'between' of Adonis ('dunkler Zwilling' – black double). And this figure is very close to the figure of Dionysus. It is not normative. It is considered to be completely opposite to our world vision but it is always present as shadow of Dionysus, but not the shadow in the simply material way. It is metaphysical shadow that is maybe more ancient than Dionysus because it belongs to the Great Mother (cosmos). Because Dionysus is always mystery as something dynamic. It is not only the eternal light that shines always (the day). That is the light that becomes darkness, that fades, that disappears, and shines anew. So there is dynamic, the mystery of dynamic, the mystery of the seed, which dies, is resurrected as a sprout or a plant. And we could consider that as a kind of cycle of something that belongs to the top essentially, goes down to the center of the night, darkness of the earth, and after that it resurrects and returns to its original place on the top of creation. That is the full cycle of the sun, of the year.

We could consider almost the same starting from the other point. There is something that belongs to the bottom, that is created by Great Mother and it arises, storming the Heaven in order to bring down the Gods and to replace them. That is a kind of rise of this Titanic Prometheus element, to dethrone the

Gods. But there is the fate of Titans to fall down as Prometheus. He could trick the Gods and win the Gods for time being (as for example Typhoeus that has overcome Zeus in Greek mythology) but the fate of Titan is to fall down. If we re-present this cycle, it's almost the same as in the case of Dionysus. Because something is rising, something achieved the highest point, and after that something falls. So if we consider that in the main features, it is almost the same scenario, almost the same tale. But the first tale begins from the sky to the earth and returns to the sky. The other tale begins from the earth; it is conquest of the heaven and the fall; the fall of angels, of titans, of Prometheus into Tartaros. Titans are climbing to the top of Olympus. They tear apart Dionysus there. And they are blamed and they are stricken by Zeus with his bolt and they fall, totally destroyed, and go to the Tartaros. So there is a kind of Noomahia that we could read normally from both sides.

And there is a kind of symmetry. Logos of Apollo and Logos of Cybele agree about the main structure of this Titanomachia but they read this process, the same tale, from two opposite points of view, two perspectives. What is conscious decision of Dionysus to come down to the center of the Hell in order to save his mother Semele and bring her back to Olympus, that is one cycle. And if we read that from other angle, we have Titan born by the Great Mother, attacking the Gods, dethroning the Gods from Heaven and the sky in their kingdom. And after that there is revenge of the fate of the destiny and they fall down to the same point from where they have appeared. So it is the same tale with two readings. That gives the problem of black double of Dionysus all its metaphysical measure. Because dealing with the cycle, with the logic of the year, of the sun, of the cycle of any kind, we are dealing always with two possibilities of reading, with two semantic structures of how to interpret that. When Dionysus arrives in the mixed society where there is a superposition of two existential horizons, there begins the open problem of the nature of Dionysus. The nature of Dionysus in our tradition is absolutely unstable. It is dynamic. It is contradictory. It is dialectic. There is not only one version to interpret this dialectic. There are two versions. Dionysian can be at the same time, almost simulacrum of Dionysian, could be Adonysian, at the same time as Dionysian. That could be pre-Dionysian and Dionysian at the same time. The problem of the European civilization is the problem of Dionysus. It is not something that is given to us as something granted. It is an open question and we could not solve it abstractly because we are this process. As neo-platonists have said, Dionysus is our mind. So our mind in that vision has its own double, black double inside of it. So our mind, our soul, our spirit is double in its nature being Dionysian. It is split. It is dealing always with something that is opposed in itself to its inner self. There is simulacrum problem that is embedded in the Indo-European mind because Indo-European mind is double and is based precisely on the superposition of two existential horizons. And we could not be sure when we are Titans and when we are Dionysus. For example, mind is Dionysian and the body is Titanic. There is as well Dionysian body and titanic mind. So the body and mind are not so clearly separated. They are intermingled because mind and body are the products and projections of Logos and not something that exists without Logos. In human world, nothing could exist without Logos. Everything we are dealing with are the products of project, of perspective of this paradigmatic approach. There are two bodies and two minds in us. There is spiritual body (the body of Resurrection in Christian doctrine) and there is material mind (titanic mind, mechanical reason, calculation). So we have as well material body and spiritual mind.

And that is the problem of dialectic of our culture because this double of Dionysus is not something that exists outside of our culture but it exists inside of our culture.

If we consider now, that is the most important concept of the Logos of Dionysus. That is why the figure of Dionysus was so important to discover, in the case of Nietzsche and developed in the philosophers that followed Nietzsche. They discovered this problem, this dark Logos. It is the real problem of European history because we could not be sure we are dealing with Dionysus or Adonis, when we are dealing with real mind or the simulacrum of mind. The Logos of Cybele now explains carefully and fully what we are dealing with. So that is the necessary dimension that explains everything in this problem of Dionysus. But to reveal and to find out the Logos of Dionysus in the case of Nietzsche was already a heroic act, a metaphysical revolution that has discovered the key to the problem of European or Indo-European, I would say, man. That is double of Dionysus. The possibility of Titanic reading of Dionysus explains why before Noology, before the introduction of Logos of Cybele, that Dionysus was mistakenly taken for Titan or some purely negative aspect of the light or white Logos of Apollo. So that is most important metaphysical discovery because with the introduction of the Logos of Cybele, everything is put in its place. Now we see why there is some dialectical misinterpretation of Dionysus and its identification with the black perversion or something upside down. And now we see the most important thing is the instability of Dionysus. So the interpretation, or speaking with Paul Ricoeur, the conflict of interpretation is open. We are dealing with two hermeneutic spaces embedded in the figure of Dionysus and there is always a possible kind of replacement, of tricks, of special metaphysical perversion or deviation of the semantic structure linked to the Logos of Dionysus.

In order to make a kind of example of this kind of Dionysian approach to understand better and deeper what is the Logos of Dionysus, I would like to say some words about Gilbert Durand. He is a very important author (Gilbert Durand, French, died recently at very old age). Gilbert Durand has created sociology of imagination. Sociology of imagination is excellent. I have made my third doctorate on sociology of imagination. He is a follower of Carl Gustav Jung, Henry Corbin, and Gaston Bachelard. But he has developed a very original version of the structure of imagination. According to Gilbert Durand, man is imagination. We have nothing but imagination and we are nothing but imagination. Everything we are dealing with are imagined structures. And he studied the roots of the imagination and how imagination works in us. It is not reflection of the existing object, but quite contrarily, the objects are the products of our imagination. First we imagine something and after, we are dealing with what we have imagined previously. That is almost the same as phenomenology.

I have already mentioned Edmund Husserl and his concept of intentionality. According to Husserl, intentional act is the act directed towards something that exists outside of our mind but that has no quality in it. So any quality that we are dealing with is inside of mind. Husserl calls that noema. The process of intentional act is noesis and noema is something that is thought of. So we are dealing with

the qualities of the objects that are inherent to our process of thought and not exterior to it. So that is phenomenology. Heidegger is a continuation to this phenomenological tradition as are many others. But Gilbert Durand proposes a different way to this phenomenological approach and he speaks about the regimes of imagination. That is very important. Gilbert Durand affirms that our imagination works in three regimes. And that is very very close to the concept of three logos. Now we are going to see how. Regime of imagination is a kind of inner state of the structure of human mind that creates different sequences of basic principle images, symbols and structure. According to Gilbert Durand, there are three regimes. First is diurne, which is the regime of day. That is the regime of light that is based on the concept of strict duality. So there are strict and absolute differences. So when we divide and separate (regime of diurne is to separate, not unite, only separate) everything is clear as in the daylight. And this regime as well is a regime of vertical organization of the space. It is linked, according to Durand, with the postural reflexes of the child. When the child begins to stay in vertical position, it is considered by imagination as a flight. He is a kind of arrow that is going to the heaven. That is the flight. Verticality is strictly connected with this regime of diurne that is heroic, warrior, male, patriarchal regime. What we have said about the Logos of Apollo could be easily applied to the regime of imagination that is called diurne. That is vertical orientation of everything and according to Durand, the regime of diurne (that is Latin word for day, daily) is the fight against the night, against the death, and against the darkness. So that is a kind of conflictual Apollonian war of light that is continuing always. In the field of mental illness, it corresponds to paranoia. Paranoia is absolutization of this diurne. So everything is separate up to the atomic quantities and there is always consolidation of the subject and destruction of the object. That is warrior. Warrior is always fighting. He destroys with the sword everything and the sword is diurne, is something that separates, not kills but separates, mutilates, puts apart. That is consolidation of the subject and destruction of the object. That is regime of diurne and that is very Apollonian and Indo-European. According to Durand, Logos is born from this regime.

So our thought is based on the development on this kind of imagination. We imagine the things separately. We separate the things and the objects and we consolidate our subject by this. Everybody is against us but we are winners of everybody. So that is the creation of hierarchy, of verticality, with the most paranoid subject at the top of the society; the tsar, the king that destroys everything and consolidates himself. So the paranoia is purely the illness of the kings because everybody is against them and everybody is planning to overthrow them (and that is the case sometimes) but they go to the final fight with the death and with the darkness because the king is surrounded by shadows and darkness and his destiny is to fight against them, to start the war, to win the war, to destroy everything and consolidate everything inside and destroy everything outside. That is normal warrior attitude. Our reason is working in this regime. Our reason differentiates. The main practice of the reason is to differentiate. (That is not so, that is here, there, that is one thing, that is other thing). And negation is as well very diurne because negation is separation; what is and what is not, what exist and what doesn't exist and so on. So any kind of pairs. But our process of our thinking is based on that and that, duality, on pairs and separations, and that exists or doesn't exist. That is how our reason proceeds.

But according to Durand, it is no more than one regime of imagination. There are two other. Both of them are called 'nocturne.' First is dramatic nocturne and the other is mystical nocturne. So what is it? That is regime of functioning of our mind in a completely different way, in a way not to separate but to unite, not to distinguish but to put together. It is not to separate something that is outside of us and to consolidate something that is inside of us, as in the case of the diurne, but quite opposite. It is to unite everything that is around us and to divide ourselves. That is purely schizophrenic attitude, in the extreme case. Schizophrenic is separated inside. So there are voices and different egos inside and there is the world around it that has reason, that is more powerful than the subject. So the world is united and strong and the subject is weak and problematic and ill. That is nocturne regime and that is based not on the logic but on the rhetoric and on the effeminization. For example when it hurts, we are happy, we are satisfied. When we lack something, we consider that a kind of gift that we lack something. For example, darkness, we are afraid of the light, something mild. That is effeminization. We call the things by completely different names in order to avoid the horror that is embedded because we are afraid of everything and of ourselves as well. We are not sure about our existence so we are using the tactic of naming the things by the opposite names in order to avoid. For example, when the women call the big husband with the diminishing names such as fish or sheep and so on with great powerful muscular man in order to diminish them in order to make them a child, to make them innocent by this magic of regime, by regime of words, and that is diminishing the proportion of the world, and as well treating something that menaces us, threatens us, as something very friendly. So that is not warrior concept but pacifist consciousness. So 'be quiet. We have something in common. You are not as horrible as you look. Let's try to find a common denominator.' In the extreme case that is Stockholm Syndrome. You are taken as a hostage and you come to the side of the terrorists. You share with them their position. Immediately you discover that they are right in their claims. Because it's very difficult to stay in this position of absolute domination of other so you say 'they are not other. The Muslims are very good. The fundamentalist terrorists are nice guys. Lets stay with them. Lets stay with the evil because it's not so evil. Lets stay with the death because its not death, its new beginning. Lets stay with the loss because it is a kind of gift.' So that is the other regime of imagination according to Durand. It's very expressive and very interesting to follow many many examples and symbols that Durand gave in his books and writings. It is a very complicated theory. I am explaining in the simplest version.

But in the field of this regime of nocturne, there are two versions as well. The radical form of nocturne is called mystical nocturne by Durand. It is a complete exchange of the object and subject, myself and the other. It is a complete betrayal of the self. So everything is outside. Inside is nothing or just reflection of outside. It is pure night. Night is the light. Bottom is top. Top is bottom and so on. Male is female. Female is male. To die is to live. To live is to die. So it is pure antiphrasis in rhetoric. You are calling the things by completely different names, by contradictory name, and you are happy with that. So that is mystical nocturne that corresponds to the Logos of Cybele. That is the absolute domination of something created by self-betrayal. The subject is not consolidated. It is completely dissipated in the imagination. And the process of dissipation of mind creates the matter or exterior world. The subject is weak and the matter is strong. But the matter doesn't exist. It is a project of this weakness of

imagination. It is not something that exists independently. It begins to exist as if it is independent, by the weakness of the subject. That is the same imagination that could imagine the strong subject or weak subject. That is inner move. That is why it is so close to the concept of Logos. And I'm using the concept of Gilbert Durand in my interpretation of different cultural, religious, and historical phenomenon.

And there is the third regime, as well nocturne, as well the regime of night, but it is called dramatic nocturne, in the works of Durand. It is not radical effeminization. It is more of less balanced effeminization. In this regime, we don't call night a day and a day a night. We are calling them dawn. So there is not light and not darkness. There is the plane, something intermediary. So we are in the dusk, in the shadow that is not the complete darkness. That corresponds to the Logos of Dionysus. And that is problematic because it could be interpreted in the radicality as darkness that pretends to be light or as light that is not too clear for example. And there is the problem of Dionysus that I have spoken of. So if the regime of diurne is paranoid and the regime of mystical nocturne is schizophrenic, what is the mental disease that corresponds to the dramatic nocturne? That is normality. That's interesting. There is no mental disease. It is normality. Because we are using in a normal situation this dramatical nocturne, the Dionysian approach to reality. Sometimes there is effeminization and sometimes there is radical separation and differentiation. So we are using both strategies at the same time.

So the problem, in the psychological way, speaking about imagination and its anthropological structure, the problem of Dionysus is the structure of our imagination. We are imagining the world precisely in that way. But if we consider that there is something material, we are approaching the mystical nocturne but staying in the dramatical nocturne. But when we distinguish something clearly and separately, when there is a kind of reason or function we are approaching the other, the light pole of this Dionysian concept. But we are using both. The mental disease begins when it is too clear or too dark in our imagination. When we are attracted too much to one of these poles. All the structure of the society could be Apollonian or in this way diurne. That is hierarchy, rationality, law, and official relations and norms. And there is a night side of the society where these laws are separated; where there are crimes, corruption, and domination of anything that is against law. So that is nocturnal aspect of society that is presented inside of the society.

So we could imagine the normal society, clear society, but as well we are imagining the dark society and night side of society and they are embedded in each other. So if there is law that rules, in the other there is crime that rules. But the crime for the criminal is the law. In Russia we have the term 'robber in law' (Вор в законе). That is completely nocturnal. That means that there is some criminal group where the chief of this criminal group (but criminal is to be against the law) has all the right and has the law to be considered as some legitimate figure. So that is the robber in law (robber who makes robbery of banks or killings). So we have a kind of state against the state or the chief or leaders of the crime groups but considered to be legal and legitimate. That is legitimization of the night side of the society. Sometimes

they interact in very special way in Russian society. Now it's difficult to say where the day ends and where the night begins because in our society both aspects are intermingled. But normally we understand that. For in Russian we have the saying, 'the правда is not право.' It's very difficult to say in English. So the law is not truth maybe. So if you go directly in the law way and accomplish all the demands you can be not right, you can be evil, being completely strict in following the law, because the law and the truth are separate. It's impossible to explain to Western Europeans because they could not understand the meaning of that. But that is the realistic understanding of the multitude of the regimes of imagination that is proper to our Slavic culture and our society. We understand that there are the laws of the night and the laws of the day and they work together. That is the richness of the imagination. We could imagine at the same time contradictions. That is why we are Dionysian up to a certain moment. We could deal with dialectic, the law and the truth. We could imagine many theories on this account. But the main basic motivation of it, that is the richness of regimes of imagination.

We could finish this explanation of Logos of Dionysus and all historical and existential analysis, adding one phrase that 'Dionysus is Dasein' as well. Dionysus is in the center. It is between, not to either pole. And it has some affinities to what Gilbert Durand called dramatic nocturne. So, that is all and now I propose to make a break and now the questions. And after, we will have the sixth lecture about the structure of European civilization based on this Noological analysis.

Introduction to Noomakhia (lecture 1) What is Noomakhia?

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Dear friends: it is the final part of our geopolitical Serbian School experimental course. That is based on the previous lecture courses that are already made. I presume that you have understood well the previous courses. They are necessary to understand this final metaphysical and philosophical summary of multipolar approach to understand the very essence of modern situation concerning cultures, civilizations, societies, globalizations, and the place of identity in this context. Noology is the new philosophical discipline or approach developed by Romanian and Russian school of thought. There are two branches in noology; one Romanian and one Russian. Romanian is represented by philosopher Lucian Blaga and his kind of continuator, modern Professor Badescu. Russian noology is completely different but having the same sources of inspiration as developed in my person and my friends. I have published already 18 volumes of Noomakhia, more or less 800 pages each one. So that is a kind of already made work. It is not finished yet. I'm working on the 20th book now. But it will have 21, maybe 22 volumes in all. So that is the project that is based on the special philosophical, metaphysical approach I try to explain in this course, in the ten lectures. They are very important because they are a kind of summary of everything said and done before. Excuse me for speaking English but the problem is not only that we lack the qualified translator from Russian to Serbian but there are kind of new created terms as well in Russian. For Russian to understand noomakhia in Russian is difficult. For Serbia, it's almost impossible because nobody can make a correct translation. If I would know Serbian well enough, I would prefer to make this lecture in Serbian but I doubt that there is someone besides myself that could make such philosophical translation. So excuse me for English in this course but I could stop or return to the point if you miss something. If you miss something you could ask if you don't understand an important term, ask myself or Jovana. We will try to translate in Serbian to find the correct term because the philosophical terminology is not sufficiently developed neither in Russian nor in Serbian. We are always having in mind German or English or French words in order to transmit the concepts. I use English in the conceptual way in order to transmit the concepts, not the terms of our native languages.

We will have ten lectures during these days, up to Friday. It's very important to be present because if you miss something you could never get what is going on in the next one. Today we will have two lectures (introduction) but they are the most important among all the others. So we need to concentrate today and to try to put other concerns aside in order to concentrate on that. If you get that, you will understand and have the keys to open any intellectual doors in this course. If not, that will be the problem. So I invite you to concentrate. Thank you for your presence.

Today's first lecture is introduction of what is noology. Noology is a new term. The term noology consists

of two roots; 'nous' (Greek word) and 'logy' (logic, logos, science, teaching). So noology is the teaching of 'nous.' What is the 'nous' in Greek? That is very serious word and if you try to translate it, it could be 'ym' in Russian. It is intelligence and intellect. It is as well mind, order, thought, or a kind of consciousness. In German it is 'Bewusstsein.' It is something that lies at the depth of the human thought. But what is human? Human is the being that is different from any other being in the world, when one thinks. It is thinking being. Every other qualities, we share with other beings but thought is the same as to be human, to be thinking. Thinking creature and thinking being is human. So the thought is the human. To think is to be human. We have bodies and we have instincts and pain, suffering, or joy. But the other creatures as well have the same. But nobody except us, in the living world, have thought. So the thought, or nous, is the essence of the man. The man is thought. All the rest is man and not only. But the thought is the only aspect of man that makes us human. To be human is to be thinking. So the nous as a kind of thought and mind is the deepest root of human being, of human-ness, of mankind. We are human because of thinking and because of nous. We are ourselves because there is the nous. Without nous, there is no human. We are human because there is the nous. So thinking about the nous and trying to explore noology is the same as to explore ourselves. It's not the kind of alienated object. To think about nous is the same as to think about us and about our deepest nature. It is not abstract. It is a kind of introspection. We are speaking and learning our depth. We are learning human-ness of human beings. That is the nous.

We could present human being from different point of view. Noology presents human being from one point of view, from its essential point of view. It is the study of the thought as such. That is very very important. Noology as well is philosophical basis of multipolarity. Why multipolarity? Because the idea of noology is that there is not only one kind of thinking that is universal and common for all of humanity. There are differences. So when we try to study nous, the intellect, the mind, the thought carefully, we discover how much the process of thinking depends on culture. If you are thinking in one culture, you think in one way. If you belong to the other culture, to the other ethnical group, to the other religion, to the other age, you think completely differently. But you are still human. You are still Serb, Russian, French, English, Chinese, or African. But belonging to different cultures and spaces and times, you think differently. So if we want to study nous and the thought as such, we need to take into account these differences. And without studying the differences of way of thinking, we could not arrive at the essence of thinking. For example, if we presume that everybody thinks as ourselves, we will study our thought. But it is only part. Because for example, Croatians, or Albanians, or Russians, or English, or American, or African, or Chinese, or Muslims think differently not only about secondary aspects but they think differently about the nature of human, about life, death, family, gender, history, time, space, God, matter, world, about everything. Noology is a kind of phenomenology of the mind. We don't prescribe how the nous should be or what the thought must be. We try to explore how it is, how thought works, and presents itself in different contexts. And this recognition of the differences without any normative prescription of how the man should normally think is the special feature of noology. So we are starting from the recognition of the differences and we are trying to understand better and deeper, the differences and not trying to unite or impose something as universal but trying to discover. That is very important feature. That is why noology is dedicated to the study of the concrete cultures. In my books in the project of noology, most of them are dedicated to European culture, for French Logos, English Logos,

Eastern European Logos, Russian Logos, American Logos, Chinese Logos, Iranian Logos, and so on. We are studying cultures and basing on the cultures, we are deducing from these cultures their way of thinking. In that way, we are arriving to have the complete vision of the human thought. We are not saying 'human should be as for example, modern European, white, atheist, materialist, and liberal.' That is a concrete result of Anglo-Saxon European civilization. It is geographically and historically limited and it is not universal. It is English way of developing their English, American, European history. And if we go to Eastern Europe, Slavic world, Russian world, Chinese world, or Muslim world, we discover that they don't go that American or English or European way. Everybody goes its own ways.

There is the conflict of civilizations as well the key to understand what is going on now with your country or our country, how we are dealing with the west, how they treat us, why they treat us so, why we respond, why we resist, or why we submit. The essence of noology is recognition of the plurality of the minds of the cultures. Plurality means that there is not only one universal, normative way of development of mind. There are minds and not the mind. Or there are different manifestations of one mind, nous, but so differently and specially that we need to study carefully each case; Serbian case, Russian case, French case, German case. It is not to create hierarchy or to say 'it's more developed or it's less developed' but to understand how everybody thinks in different conditions. That is noology.

Noology is multilevel analysis. In noology we are using philosophy. The minimal knowledge of philosophy is necessary to understand what is going on because the philosophy is the mirror of the thought. Studying philosophy, we are saving time to study the other, politics and history, because in philosophy, everything is in contact with it. It is simultaneously presented in the philosophy. So if we are reading the history of philosophy, we are reading the history of humanity. Why? Because to think is to be human. And philosophers consecrate all their life and all their efforts to thinking. So they are more human than other. They are more clear human than other. They are making the same thing as everybody but in special way. They are concentrated on this human-ness of human. And the other as well participate. We could say that every man is philosopher. But the philosopher is complete, accomplished, and perfect man. They are dedicated to the main goal of human, to think. That is why philosophy is so important in noology. History of religions is very important because religion is the other way to think. Religion is based on the premises of the thought. So without at least some knowledge of different religions, we could not understand noology because religion is as well the mirror of the thought. There is projection of our thought on the gods, on the relations between the reason of being and the source of being, creation, god, time, and many other things in religion that reflect the structure of nous. So in noology, we need to know a little bit of religion.

What is important is that, in noology, we need to have some knowledge of geopolitics because geopolitics is concretization of civilization. So that is a kind of generalization and if we discovered geopolitical position of thinker, we could not understand what he means because we are defined by philosophical tradition and religious tradition but we are as well defined by our position in the world and our way of thinking. Our own cultural noology is defined by our geopolitical position. If you belong to the civilization of the sea (sea power) or the civilization of the earth, you think differently. That is very important difference. Position on the geopolitical map of the world is very important to interpret concretely the thought. So geopolitics is absolutely unavoidable. World history is main topic. We need to

know the history of different peoples and cultures. We also need to know basic knowledge of sociology because sociology is the discipline that shows how much the way of our being is defined by society. So that is very important because society is very important way of self reflection because if we know how much society and its principles are inside us, we will discover that our individuality and originality is almost zero, is almost non-existent quantity. Everything in us is put by the society. We think 'I'm thinking that.' It is not 'I' that thinks. Society through me thinks. Sociology is very important. Anthropology and above all, the new anthropological school from Franz Boas and Claude Lévi-Strauss and the other tradition. And I suggest that in development of our course, we absolutely need to have a kind of anthropological course about anthropology. It is a very important part. And modern anthropology shows ethnical tradition and condition of the living and the nature and the culture and the balance between the nature and culture defines the values of the society and how different the societies are. That is very important gain of modern anthropology. Old anthropology of 19th century was based on the evolutionary theory. So everybody is developing. There are developed society and underdeveloped societies. Modern anthropology shows there are no such things as development. There are differences. And in order to study archaic society, we could discover the society more complicated and more complex than our society but they are different. They are not underdeveloped. They are not childish stage of the same culture. That is maybe mature, maybe childish, maybe old stage of different culture that we need to study carefully without projecting our own ideas on them. That is the gain of modern anthropology. That is one of the main principles of noology and noomahia.

There is ethno-sociology that puts together ethnology and sociology. You had a course already about ethno-sociology. It's very important and key course. The theory of imagination - I would suggest strongly to read the books of Carl Gustav Jung, Gaston Bachelard, but above all Gilbert Durand (French author) about sociology of imagination. That is very important. His methods and his teachings will be used in our course as a kind of methodological basis. I will explain in short terms what is sociology of imagination of Gilbert Durand. I have made doctrine on sociology of imagination and it will be of use. Phenomenology - I would recommend you to study Heidegger and Husserl. The most important idea of phenomenology is that the thing we are thinking of exists in our mind. All the qualities of the things belong to our mind. So what the thing is beyond our mind is something we could guess. There is no evidence and no quality. It's almost nothing. For example, existence or not existence of the thing outside of our perception changes absolutely nothing in our relations with the thing. That is the main law of phenomenology. The things are present inside of our thought and our thinking process. That is the main law of phenomenology developed by Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger and other philosophers of the same line.

The structuralism of Ferdinand de Saussure, Lévi-Strauss, and Paul Ricoeur is very important as well because structuralism is philosophical method that explains that everything exists in the structures. Structure is something invisible but that defines the meaning. So the language is much more important than the discourse or the things that are said in the language. The language predefines what we are going to say. So what we are saying are citations from the language and from the dictionary. So it is our speech that we are so proud of thinking that it is something original. 'Let's go to the cinema' for example, we say as if let's be the world, let's be the light, God's announcement from nothing, from the void but it is pure citation of what many other men and women say to each other. 'Let's go to the

cinema.' That is citation and that is defined by the structure of the language. There is nothing, zero originality in that. And with all our judgments the same, all our words and discourses, we are repeating the things that were said many millions and millions of times before us by the other. And there is no author. There is repetition of the structure. That is the language that speaks by itself. That is the concept and philosophy of structuralism. It is very interesting and very important methodological aspect that we use in noomahia.

I suggest reading Heidegger as in Fourth Political Theory. I suggest reading traditionalist philosophers of the school of Rene Guenon and Julius Evola. They are very important. I suggest reading Bachofen about the gender and the matriarchy. It's very important because the study of matriarchy is the essential part of noomahia. I will explain why. Bachofen has written the book that is called 'Mutterrecht' ('The Law of Mother'). That is classic book about how pre-Indo-European mediterranean matriarchy was. That is very important and it is basic classical work. We will mention, as well, structuralist author Georges Dumezil and Claude Levi-Strauss, as I have said, about modern structuralist anthropology and ethnology. There are more or less the kind of fields or methods of schools we are using in noology. But there are many many studies, pluri-disciplinary studies of such kind so there is nothing new or nothing concrete in everything I have just said. And what is originality of noomahia as such? That is the most important point. All the mentioned disciplines and methods and fields of studies are auxiliary. They help us to understand. They are tools. But what is the main method? The main method is the concept that this time is something partly new (and I will explain why) about existence of three Logos.

What is three Logos? My idea is that the nous as a thought or mind or intellect manifests itself in three distinguished, different forms. In three - no less and no more. That is approximation as any methodological approach. But that is what the French call 'grilles de lecture.' That is a kind of reading. If we accept that, everything will be put in the context of this methodological approach. So one mind and three major forms with many subdivisions, many other forms included in this main global general forms of the process of the thought that I'm calling Logos. So there is one nous and three Logos. How three Logos relate to the nous, we put out of the question. That is too metaphysical and is not so important for us. The most important idea is that the nous cannot manifest itself without passing through these three Logos. There is no thought outside of these three Logos. But these three Logos, we could find in any culture. They have no destiny for one of them. There is no hierarchy between these three Logos. And we find all three Logos necessary in any kind of culture. So that is the result of my work and the result of the studies and research. I started from the hypothesis that maybe we will find them in any culture and maybe not. After studying any culture in the world, including most archaic one in Oceania, in Africa, in Indian of Southern and Northern America, I have arrived at the point where this hypothesis was confirmed. In any culture and in any society, archaic or modern or postmodern or European or not European, in any time in any form of society, we could discover these three Logos in different proportions and in different balance. They could be combined in many ways, in million ways. And that is dynamic. I will explain this balance of the Logos and how they are changing. But they are present everywhere. No culture, no people, no religion, and no region could say 'we have this Logos and only this, or these two.' Every culture has three Logos. That is very important. That shows that we could not reconstruct the hierarchy between the culture or people, because the three Logos combine with each

other in completely special way. And the way of combination is proper to each culture. So that is kind of our history. Our deep identity of the people, of the culture, of the religion consists precisely in this combination and the changes of the balance of these three Logos. Because there are so many forms to combine them, there are unlimited possibilities of the human society and no way to create hierarchy because the archaic society can be with domination of one Logos and modern with other and vice versa. There is no general rule that could be universal.

And that is very important point because that shows that we are dealing in our science, in our methodology, in our politics, and in our culture with a kind of racist colonial approach in any culture. We are just projecting our own Logos as something universal. Careful study of the culture shows that that is illegitimate. Racism is the idea to say 'my Logos or my special culture is universal' without studying the other and without asking the other. And after that, after declaring that our culture is universal one, we put ourselves as example for the other. The other are either the same as ourselves or are less developed. And that is the case of modern European civilization and of us in the way we belong to it. If we accept that, we are entering into this racist attitude toward the history, toward the past, toward ourselves. And we are declaring 'that is universal, that is the only way to develop and everybody is going that way. There is only one culture and one Logos. And our Logos is universal and the measure of the things.' That is completely wrong and is based on exaggeration of our own self. And that is something I will show that is completely illegitimate. And there is not only open biological racism. Modern liberalism, communism, and any kind of globalization are absolutely racist because they are basing on the universalism of the historic experience of the part of the humanity put as the whole of the humanity and as the goal. For example, who is in the eyes of globalists African negro? He is the man on the way to be white, modern, capitalist, liberal, European, Euro-centric man. He is a kind of underdeveloped European. He is not the representative of the culture going its own way. It's something that is undeveloped. And modern idea of tolerance that we need to tolerate him precisely as something imperfect, something invalid, something on the way to be as ourselves is completely racist. We don't recognize the other as complete and perfect human being different than us. We think that they are going our way and they are obliged to be and there is no other way, and we have pity on them. There is very nice film by Werner Herzog, 'Where the Green Ants Dream.' He shows that the people of Australia not only cannot follow Western example but they don't want to do that. They are going their own way different from Western and that is their decision of their culture. And this clash of Anglo-Saxon racist version of the history and this aboriginal Australian vision of their own identity. They are not the Westerner of the second sort. They are Australian of the first sort for themselves.

That is ethical aspect of noology. Noology is a fight for the human dignity for any society, without hierarchy and without this projection. It is the basis of anti-colonial metaphysics. Many teachings pretended historically to be anti-colonial (Marxism and liberalism as well). But they were based on the universal version of the history. For Marxism, we need to develop African society in order to make them Socialists and they will be equal but destroying their values and their system regarding them as underdeveloped in their natural state. The same for liberalism. Liberalism and Communism are in the same way as racist as racism of Hitler. That is main basis for fourth political theory, that we need to find some other way outside of three political ideologies. Noology is the metaphysical basis of why it is so

needed, because doing differently and treating the other people differently, we are projecting our racist approach and we are making equation between ours and normative and universal. But that is a violation of the truth. It's pure colonialist struggle for power and not understanding not knowledge, not wisdom, and not the truth. It's something completely different. So that is why noology is so important. It is the philosophical and metaphysical basis of multi-polar world. And the concept of three Logos shows the differences that could exist in combination and in different cultures.

Now what these three Logos are - here we could remind Nietzschean concept of the Greek God Apollo and the Greek God Dionysus. Apollo and Dionysus are two Greek Gods but Friedrich Nietzsche has interpreted them not as object of cult or worship. They were taken as metaphors, as kind of symbols or figures. So you should not be worshippers of Apollo to be Apollonian. You should not be worshipper of Dionysus and participate in the orgies to be Dionysian. To be Dionysian or Apollonian for Nietzsche was completely different meaning. To be Apollonian was to be hierarchical, to belong to the logical way to understand the world and to be Dionysian was to be irrational and intuitive understanding of the world. That is a kind of day way of thinking in Nietzsche (Apollonian) and night, dawn, dusk way of thinking (Dionysian). Nietzsche divided the cultures into Apollonian and Dionysian. So the cultures of Nietzsche were of two kinds. That was taken from Nietzsche and developed by many many other authors and now it is almost commonplace in the history and study of cultures. We say Dionysian style and Apollonian style following Nietzsche but going further. And I accept that and I think that we could affirm that there is the Logos of Apollo and there is the Logos of Dionysus. The nous (mind, thought) expresses itself through Apollonian or Dionysian Logos. That is very important. That sounds like Nietzschean approach and it is because I am inspired by Nietzsche in that way.

Trying to discover Dionysian Logos more, I have written a kind of prequel for Noomahia that is called 'In Search of the Dark Logos.' My idea was to regard history of philosophy not from Apollonian point of view that is prevailing and dominating, but from the second Logos, to construct the history of philosophy basing on Dionysian reading. We know exactly how Apollonian reading of the history of philosophy is. That coincides with the history of philosophy always. We know what Apollo thought because the history of philosophy is Apollonian thought so Apollo thought precisely as a philosopher thought during the ages. And my idea was to discover how Dionysus would think regarding the same topics, the same categories, the same opposition and relations. That was as well a kind of invitation of Nietzsche and a little bit of Heidegger and many postmodern thinkers tried to do the same, tried to apply this Dionysian approach in order to decipher the history of philosophy. It is not so unique but I tried by myself. I have called it dark Logos because it is clear for me that Apollonian Logos is light and Dionysus is night or shadow or darkness. Going into the field of this dark Logos and trying to read with the eyes of dark Logos Hegel, Heidegger, Kant, Plato, Aristotle, and the others (and all that is described more or less in my book 'In Search for Dark Logos' that is prequel or 0 volume of noomahia), in the kind of field research in metaphysics and not in the idea I had before, but working with this task to imagine the alternative history of philosophy based on Dionysian approach, I have discovered in the practical way very important basis of all noomahia. There are some phenomena including in culture, in religion, in philosophy, in history of philosophy, in science, in art, in human psychology, in unconsciousness that could not enter in the field of Dionysian Logos. So something fits but there is a new field that is outside

that could not fit into the Apollonian Logos clearly but could not fit as well into the Dionysian Logos. That was a kind of practical empirical discovery in the field of metaphysics because there was some conceptual field, for example the philosophy of Heraclitus or Democritus, atomic theory, or the theory of modern science, that are absolutely not Apollonian or Dionysian. Searching dark Logos, I have arrived to the point that there is something outside of this new Logos. There is the third one. Behind the Logos of Dionysus was hidden something else that was in the shadow of Dionysus. If Dionysus is the shadow of Apollo, there is the other shadow of the shadow.

That I have called in my studies the Logos of Cybele. Cybele is the name for very ancient Anatolian Goddess (the same as Greek Rhea). Cybele was the name of the mother Goddess of ancient Anatolia. It was before Hittites, there was the very special pre-Indo-European people of Hattians, and Hittite Indo-European language has taken this Goddess and integrated into their own religious context and after that the Phrygians have as well and developed the cult of Cybele. And that was very interesting circle of the concept basing on the ritual castration of the man and the rule of the Great Mother. So the priests of Cybele were castrated and turned into the eunuch. So that was the emasculation of the man and that was the part of the great vision of matriarchy when the position of the man is completely different than we know. It is completely different from the Dionysian position because Dionysus in his cult is the center of interaction of the Bacchae, of the women, but as well of the men. That is the presence of the man in the center of the human existence. Dionysus is not transcendent Dionysus. He is immanent but he is man. That is immanence of the man, man-God, God as a man, man, not human. And this presence is a kind of immanent presence of transcendence. Dionysus is not the darkness, not black Logos. It is the presence of the light in the darkness. That is a kind of sun of the night. It is the man inside of the middle of the immanent, chthonic, feminine existence. So that is the male point in female reality. It is a kind of ray of the sun that goes through the darkness and that comes to the center of the darkness in order to create new dawn. That is Dionysus. And it could not be identified with darkness or with chaos. And all the orgies and all the rites and worships and all the topics linked to Dionysus were not so easy to interpret. That is not reversal of the normal Apollonian order. It was not a kind of revolution. Dionysus is the same as Apollo but coming not in the day but in the night. That was the male in the night, the light in the darkness, but 'in' the darkness. That is a kind of sun that comes down in the evening in order to appear anew in the morning. But when he passes, the moment of midnight, he is invisible, he is hidden, and there is no sun in the middle of the night but the sun is. If he will be absolutely absent, there will be no morning and no dawn. It is not the day but it is the sun of the night. The sun of the day is the same as Apollo or Helios. Where is the sun when there is no sun? Where is the heaven when there is no heaven? Where is the male when there is no male and only darkness, earth, immanence, matter, and female principle? He is hidden but he is. That is Dionysian Logos. It's very special. He creates the new kind of dynamic vision, a kind of balance of the genders and metaphysics, the balance of transcendence and immanence, of heaven and the earth. It is the heaven in the earth and that is heavenly earth, earth in the heaven. So that is a combination of opposition. It is dialectics. That is Dionysian Logos.

But in order to understand correctly what is the Logos of Dionysus, we need to introduce third Logos and that is something that changes completely all the other concepts and theories that existed before

and that are principles or tools of modern culture, the history of cultures, and culturology. So the third Logos is absolutely new. That is a kind of essential feature of noology that there is the third Logos, the black one, the Logos of Cybele. Why was the Logos of Cybele discovered so late? Why did everybody before not speak about three Logos? When I started to try to understand, to solve this metaphysical problem, I have discovered a very interesting thing. For the dominating Logos of Apollo, this Logos cannot exist because seeing the situation from the purely Apollonian point of view, there could not be the other Logos beyond the Apollonian one because the Apollonian concept is exclusivist and purely male and based on a kind of equivalence; the man as male is a man and man is human, so to be man and to be human is the same and everything that doesn't fit into this concept has no right to pretend to be called Logos. So Logos is Apollo, man and human. And everything that is not male (female for example), that is not logical doesn't belong to Logos and doesn't belong to human. And that is a kind of beast or some object and not the subject. Subject could be only Apollonian. And the Nietzschean idea to enlarge the concept of Logos and to give the status of Logos to Dionysus was already revolution because that has shown that it could be different approach to the Logos. That is absolutely crucial. And with Dionysus we have discovered that there could be Apollonian approach and there could be other approach. But together, Apollonian approach and Dionysian approach, they could not let the third Logos be because both of them are male, open as Apollonian or hidden as Dionysian, exclusive as Apollonian or inclusive as Dionysian, but they are male Logos. And the Logos of Cybele is not male. And from the male prevailing point of view, it could not be Logos. So it pass without being remarked. It is a kind of noise. It is not words. It is not speech. For the metaphysical male's ears, what the woman says is noise and not speech. It is something as the sound of the nature for example. It can be beautiful or less beautiful, that depends.

That is idea that Platonism is purely Apollonian philosophy. There are ideas that are above and there are images and icons that are below. There is verticality. There is the father that is eternal example and paradigm and there is the son that is a kind of phenomenological imitation of the father and nothing, khora, matter that has no quality. And the most important definition of Apollonian approach to the Logos is that beyond the Logos is nothing. Beyond father or son or matter that has no quality, so nothing, no being, darkness. Without quality, not Logos but what is important not Logos. There is the Logos of the father that is Apollonian. There is the Logos of the sun, immanent, that is the Logos of Dionysus and there is no Logos, because we are completely machist, we are patriarchal tradition, so we don't let the other part of the reality to have Logos. So we deny that and that is why it was so hidden. And only starting to apply, to create, to describe a kind of approach to Dionysian history of philosophy, we discovered there is something below the lower border of Dionysian vision because Dionysian approach is not the castration. It is not the kind of dissolution of the great mother. It is the reach of the depth of hell in order to resurrect (Dionysian idea), to descend in order to ascend, to go down in order to go back to Heaven. It is the sacrifice and it is the death but in order to be resurrected. It is completely different. It is going from the top to the bottom in order to return to the top. Dionysus is the extreme version of Apollonian Logos that is different completely and creates different structure. So that is the other inclination of nous. Maybe the nous is the same but the form is completely different. But starting to work with Dionysian Logos seriously, I have discovered that there is something else. And that was a kind of metaphysical discovery that first of all was a kind of illumination and revelation in a philosophical

sense but after thinking about that, I have arrived to the point that we could instrumentalize that. We could go beyond the Apollonian and Dionysian border and recognize this attitude as the Logos, as third form of the nous or the third Logos, the Logos of Cybele. And after that everything comes into harmony. After that we have complete explanation of all the possible versions of cultures, of philosophies, of religions, and relations between them.

So we could imagine how the nous is divided in three ways in three Logos. These three Logos, each one of them, creates a world or the worlds by itself. So we can live in many Apollonian worlds, in many Dionysian worlds, and we could live in many Cybelian worlds. There is not only one world. There are multitudes, multiplicity, plurality of Apollonian worlds, Dionysian worlds, and Cybelian worlds. And they are embedded in each other, they are merged in each other, and they represent so rich content of the cultures, of the thought, of the art, of the history that we discover immediately the spiritual treasury of the human mind. But it is not the chaos. That is a kind of inner relations between them because we could describe pure forms of these three Logos. For example, what is the universe of Apollo? It is the idea that everything is created from the top to the bottom. Everything is a kind of descending process. Platonic philosophy is so actual and was always absolutely actual because it is the most perfect form to perfect this Apollonian Logos. Platonism is the same as Apollonian Logos. So in any kind of Logos of Apollo, in any culture, having the contact with Greek Platonism or having no contact with Platonism will create the same Apollonian version. I have discovered that, for example, in the Nilo-Saharan of Africa, with no links with Greece, in the very archaic tradition, Logos of Apollo, but exactly the same idea. There is the Father God that has created everything and the people are the sons of the Father God and we are descending from the Heaven and we are returning to that. There is no earth dimension in all that. The earth is the lowest line of going down in order to get back. There is pure patriarchal attitude. Everything is based on the honor, on the fight, the fight against the death and darkness, every man is a light man. That is a kind of hierarchy inside of society based through this line. That is Platonic European feudal traditional Serbian Russian vision of the society.

By the Shilluk, by the Nuer, by the Dinka tribes of Nilo-Saharan people or for example the other African people of Western Africa in Yoruba people, we have the same purely Platonist vision. Sometimes there are kind of examples existing in the stars and all that we are dealing with are the reflections or phenomenological mirrors of what is going on above the stars. So there is Platonism that is not only in the texts or dialogues of Plato but there is Apollonian Logos. They have no contact with Plato. For example, Pharaonic tradition of Egypt was as well the sun from above, from the top that goes down and creates this kind of pyramidal version of the world. So the base is square and the top is unity. So there is purely Apollonian building in pyramid. That is why fire was presented in Plato as pyramid. It's fire in Greek. Pyramid is a kind of fire that goes to the top. So fire is sacred and light is sacred and we are sons of the light and from this point the patriarchy and absolute domination of male principle and submission of the female principle and all Apollonian things. So the Logos of Apollo is not people who read Plato and people who have applied the texts of Plato to their society. Partly that was the case but we could not explain any Apollonian society with the reading of Plato. Plato was the part. I will explain in the future lectures what was concretely the Plato philosophy. But what is important now is that Apollonian Logos is Logos. It is not Platonic. Plato is reflection or mirror of this Logos. It is excellent form to express

it. It is perfect art or revelation of this Logos in the most complete form. So it is the best introduction to the Apollonian Logos. But that is not creation of Plato. It is creation of nous. It is the way how the Apollonian Logos in nous works and how it reveals and manifests itself. That is very important. That is no artificial creation of some human mind. Human mind can be following Apollo's line and can be Platonic. We are born with Platonism. We can be inner born Platonists if this Logos dominates in us, in our culture, in our religion, or in our system of values. And that defines our world. We regard the Heaven more than earth. So we are light. We have no weight. We worship the winged creatures and angels for example or birds. Our Gods are transparent. They live in the air or in the Heaven or in the clouds. So for our Christian Indo-European tradition, it's Apollonic. Plato was a part of this culture. Almost all the Greek culture, before Plato, after Plato, not only Greek but Roman, Iranian, Indian, and Slavic tradition were all Apollonic.

And for us, it's so clear that we think that the world is such and there is no other world. But we are living in the Apollonian world. Our tradition is based on the Apollonian vision. And the discovery of the Logos of Dionysus is already spiritual metaphysical revolution. It could be different. We could live in different world with different symmetry and different organization not based on the worship of the transcendence. We could see this sacredness in the immanence. Dionysian world is organized differently with different meaning of the same words, of the same figures, and of the same Gods. In this Dionysian aspect of Christian tradition (we will speak about that more) is the figure of Christ. That is the God and the man. He is transcendent and he is immanent. He is eternal as in Apollonian world where everything is eternal in essence, and he is historic, so he came into the time. If we regard in this way we don't oppose Apollonian Christianity or Dionysian Paganism. We understand better that in the same tradition in Christianity we have both figures; transcendence of the trinity of the God and the immanence of the Christ. So we have Apollonian and Dionysian aspect in very special situation.

In other traditions, we discover the same. There are many other, in different tradition, the figure as Dionysus, not with the same name but with the same function, with some ecstatic liberation because the name of Dionysus in Roman culture was Liber (liberation, freedom). So this was liberation from the weight of the matter, from this chthonic aspect of human presence. And that is a kind of leap into the freedom of God. It is the leap from the human to divine, from the time into eternity. That is the essence of Dionysian cult. It is a kind of heresy in our Christian tradition. So we are in time and with bodies. We are coming into touch with the eternal that is God. That is a kind of metaphysical, anthropological, and ontological leap. So that is the essence of Dionysian tradition. And that is not the case that Eucharist in our church is made with the wine, with the blood of God, and with the grain, because the bread and wine were two symbols of Eleusinian Mysteries where Dionysus and Demeter were in the center of that. That is continuation of the special symbolical tradition based on Dionysus and Apollo. And when we see the world through the Logos of Dionysus, we have one world. If we see the world with the Logos of Apollo, we are dealing with different world. And there are different symmetries and different metaphysics. For example, Dionysus is the cycle. It is the kind of cycle around the point of eternity. And Apollonian Logos is eternity itself. It is eternity. So we are going from eternity and are returning to eternity. That is what is most important in the Apollonian idea. From then, in the everlasting law, the tradition, something should not be changed. The eternity of the ethic, of the cult is the belief in the

eternity that pretends to be eternal itself. That is something eternal that is outside of the process of the time. And the time is not important. Only the time of the return is important. The only time that is important in the case of the Apollonian is the return to the eternity because the time itself is the reflection. As Plato says 'it is the mirror of eternity.' The ethics of Apollonian Logos is return, the reflection to the reflected object. That is idea that is the archetype, paradigm for eternity.

The world we are living in defined by the Logos of Apollo is precisely based on some idea for example that we are using for example the words in our speech as if the essence of them were eternal. So we don't name any time the different but similar things with new names. We say 'this book.' 'This book,' all that are books. And books as concept exist eternally. That is eternal books. And in our religion, it is a kind of pure projection. There is the Bible as eternal book that was created and written in the eternity. Everything is eternal; everything in the book, and the book is eternal. So every name we mention is eternal in itself. It always existed in the time of Adam. So that is a kind of Apollonian world that is very famous for us. We think the world is Apollonian in our traditional education. We are educated in Apollonian culture. We are dealing with logic. But logic of Aristotle is based precisely on the laws of the eternity. He says A is A. Or if there is no A there's a second Law, or A or not A, third law of logic. But in the world around us, there is no such things. Everything is double. Something exists and not exists, dies and is born. So in the physics, there is no logic. Logic is something that describes Apollonian world, the world that we take for granted, we are dealing with but that doesn't exist. It is a kind of revelation. Logic is a revelation. The A is A. Only God is God. Everything is some half created by God and half nothing. So there is no point in the universe where the A is A. A=A never, nowhere. So only God is God. That was logic, something for us that is so natural, something absolutely transcendental. It is the essence of Apollonian Logos that is working inside of our brain because it is working inside of our culture forming the semantical axis, the paradigm of our way of thinking. That is Logos of Apollo.

So what is the Logos of Dionysus? That is interesting. When we are staying in Aristotle, we are coming to the other branches of his description of the sciences; we discover that for example, dealing with physics, Aristotle said every thing (he used the word *ὄν*, being) is double. It has form and matter. That is anti-logical concept that unity is double. Something that is united, everything that exists is double. You see one thing but in the reality, there are two things in one thing; matter and form. And if you separate them, there is nothing. That is Aristotelian physics. That is completely different Dionysian approach to the world. And that is described not by the logic but is described by the rhetoric because it is one but not exactly one, not as in the logic one, because there is double. There are two things in one thing; the form and the matter. And Dionysian way of thinking, Dionysian Logos is manifested by the capacity to think dialectically, to conceive one thing as two things at the same time, one and two, but in the logic, one or two. But in Dionysian world, no, one and two. There is not 'here man, here woman. One and one.' No. There is androgyne. Androgyne is something that is not a kind of sum of man and woman. It is not addition. 'We are taking man and we are adding woman and there is androgyne.' No. There is something that precedes in Dionysian Logos to existence of male and female. The androgyne is not the result of combination. That is the source of the gender. That is not Apollonian way to think. That's Dionysian way. Androgyne is the figure of Dionysus. There is two in one before there is two. There is in the middle, in the center before there are poles. For example, in Apollonian world, there is one pole and

there is other pole and what is between is the secondary. It's defined by limits, by poles. In Dionysian worlds is something completely different. There is what is between and its projections create poles. So we could live in the world, in the culture, in the religion of dialectical Dionysian approach; the two nature in Christ (the God and man). It is something that is irrational for the Dionysian version. Or how it could be the same and not the same, for example, in the holy trinity. So there is a kind of dialectical approach that creates a completely new symmetry in religion, in art, and in philosophy.

And this Dionysian Logos is possible but it is presented much more than in the philosophy in poetry, in sacred, in art, in language, not in the mathematical language but in the human language, in rhetoric, not in the logic. Logic is Apollonian. Rhetoric is Dionysian because the rhetoric is precisely violation of the laws of the logic. What is rhetoric when we use some rhetorical formula? We try to violate, to give the part as a whole (that is metonymia) and the other. All the figures of rhetorics are based on this Dionysian Logos. And that is why literature, art, poetry, and the other, mythology rather than philosophy is the privileged field of the Dionysian Logos. And that is not the lesser Logos. That is important. Plato has said 'lets put all the poets out of our ideal state' because it is Apollonian understanding of what is Dionysian. Apollo thinks that Dionysus is a kind of sub-Apollo, something that would be Apollo, something incomplete. It is a little bit of Apollonian ethnocentrism, Apollonian racism. He thinks that he himself is the whole and all the rest is part of himself or the kind of images, sometimes perverted. So Plato said 'lets put poets and mythologists out of our purely philosophical Apollonian state because they belong to the world of Dionysus and they have no place in the Apollo republic.' Plato's republic is Apollo's republic. They should be put out because they are considered to be impure because they are rhetoric. They are dealing with inclination, not with the straight line but with the curves. They are dealing with combination of the structured elements in very very fantastic way. And that is the kind of creative spirit of the art that is Dionysian. But as well we could find in art, Apollonian line, but the majority of the art and the poetry is purely Dionysian and that is the realm of the immanence and of rhetoric.

And there could be the philosophy of Dionysian style. In the modern philosophy, phenomenology is purely Dionysian. I have discovered finally, studying Heidegger for many years that Heidegger tried to create Dionysian philosophy. He tried and he succeeded in that. He developed this phenomenological aspect and his concept of dasein in purely Dionysian, is a kind of immanence. It should be regarded not as a kind of, in Apollonian way, a kind of projection of dasein, of the being. The being is Apollonian. But dasein (t/here being) is in Serbian 'ту биће.' But what is interesting is that in German 'da' is not there (ту, тамо). 'Da' is not here, not there, neither ту or тамо but in between. 'Da' is in between - not here and not there. And in Old Slavonic language there was the form that is conserved in present Serbia - овде биће (овде - neither ту or тамо - between). So dasein is being not there, not here, but in between because there and here we could strictly define without us but between is precisely the point where the Dionysus exists. Dionysus is in between (овде). He is not there as Apollo. He is not here as something immanent. He is in between, always in between in the middle. So dasein is very Dionysian term in itself. овде биће - neither тамо биће nor ту биће. овде. In Russian we have lost this third grammatical form and maybe its a kind of luck that in Serbian you have conserved of this name in your language in order to understand better Heidegger, in order to understand better this Dionysian possibility of philosophy, to think not from the top, not from the bottom, but from the middle, nor from

the two poles and after there is something that is the center. No. Thinking from the center, from between. And trying to express the idea of Heidegger in English, sometimes the philosopher translates as such - t/here being. Not there. Not here. Because they have no 'овде' as your rich Serbs.

So the idea is that third Logos and more fascinating is third Logos. I think that already to compare two Logos, Apollo and Dionysus, in full measure was so revealing for creation of not one history of philosophy but two versions. So you could consult not only Apollonian bookshelf but as well Dionysian. And if we apply this method, we will be not obliged to write all these volumes anew but we could make a kind of combination of existing works, of existing philosophical and religious tradition, and to reorganize our intellectual space, to reveal, to reshape our understanding of the history of the philosophy. And the history of philosophy is the history of our society and the history of humanity.

So next point of noology is that we could find the Logos of Apollo and the Logos of Dionysus in any culture as well. So every people, every culture knows these two Logos. It's very important. So there is no people of Apollo or people of Dionysus. There are Logos of Apollo and Dionysus in any human culture. But if we remark their relations, they are not so good relations, because Apollo thinks in one way, he creates this world with verticality, with this patriarchal symmetry, and he puts out poets or Dionysian. There is a kind of fight between two Logos, one nous, two Logos. And they fight against each other. We are approaching why noomahia, because noomahia is the fight of the nous or the fight inside of the nous. But the real dramatic aspect all this obtains when we come to the third Logos because there is the third new world that creates not from the top to the bottom, not from the center, but from the bottom to the top. It is a new symmetry. And this is lost Logos lost and denied by both Logos of Apollo and in the lesser scale by the Logos of Dionysus. And what could be such a universe and such a world created on this symmetry, on this Logos of Cybele.

The world of Cybele and Logos of Cybele, it is the great mother that creates everything from herself. That is very important. That is absence of any male principle outside of the great mother. It's absolute inclusiveness. So there is no God but the great mother. There is nobody but the great mother. There is only great mother earth that creates everything from herself and kills everything because she is at the same time the tomb and the cradle. So there is no two point of line. There is one and the same point of death and life. For example, the Goddess of death and the Goddess of life is only one mother that creates, gives life, and kills. So she creates the sun, the male principle, from herself without father, she uses it as a lover, and she emasculates, castrates, and kills it and make its revival once more. So that is Cybelian method that is explained in many forms in many cults in many worships but there is a kind of philosophy inside that is very interesting and very profound philosophy. There is no transcendence at all. There is no heaven. The heaven is the kind of mirror of the earth. So any kind of heaven is only reflection of the same of the matter. And we are coming to absolute materialistic immanence because immanence of Dionysus was not materialistic, it was spiritualist immanence, it was almost always in the middle, half spirit and half matter, and this half is before. It's not the sum but before that exists before the matter and the spirit. And the great mother and the Logos of great mother is the idea that great mother creates and kills everything. And it is not the eternity or the cycle. It is something that is going in its way with the blind and absolute power. So there is a kind of progress that is the growth from the bottom to the top. It is also in the Apollonian way a titanic battle of the chthonian powers and forces directed against the

heaven and the rule of the male Logos of Apollo. So Cybelian Logos is the third creation of the new world that is titanic, chthonic, and feminist in some way, not because there is equivalence between man and woman (that is much more Dionysian), but it is absolute domination of the mother over everything else.

So we will follow this later. In order to conclude this first lecture, what is important is that three Logos I have explained stay in the absolute fight because they create the world, the system, the society, the cultures, the religions, the cults, the relations, the values, the political systems that are based on completely different approaches. They are in conflict and that is noomahia. There is already a kind of contradiction between Apollo and Dionysus but with Cybele and Apollo, contradiction reaches its utmost highest point because there is a serious titanomachy or gigantomachy between two versions of the vision because there are two Logos fighting seriously. The titans, the autochthonic sons of Cybele try to storm the Heaven and the Apollonian Gods try to defend it. And what is in philosophical way is Democritus with his idea, is purely Cybelian philosophy. It is Epicurus. And that is our scientific modern European science of Modernity that is purely Cybelian. And that is a kind of revenge of the Logos of Cybele after the thousands of years of domination of Apollo with Dionysus. So there is a kind of Cybelian eschatology we are living in. So if we consider now, not our spiritual tradition, cultural tradition, religious tradition, ethical tradition, but our scientific vision, it is purely atomistic, materialistic, progressivist, and based on this symmetry from the bottom to the top. So the Cybele doesn't belong to the past, to the archaic time. The Logos of Cybele is something we are dealing with. And this Cybelian world vision we could find in as well in the ancient times, in our civilization, in other civilization. There is not Cybelian civilization. In any form of civilization, we could find all three Logos and they are fighting everywhere and we are living inside of this noomahia. It is not something that is purely theoretical. We are living that. And this noomahia is going through us, through our politics, through our culture, through our science, through our identity, and through our culture. And that is a kind of the end of the first lecture and that is most important part and most important principles of what is noomahia as a basis of theory of multipolar world.

Introduction to Noomakhia (lecture 6) Christian Logos

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Transcript of Noomahia Lecture no. 6 - European Civilization

Now the lecture number 6 that has as a topic, European Civilization. Now we put aside other Indo-European societies and we concentrate on European history, and European cultures, and European people. So now it is clear that European civilization is based on this superposition of two existential horizons and has a center, and the main problem is the problem of Dionysus and its interpretation. So European history is titanomachia or noomahia and the basic condition of this titanomachia was the fact of this coming of Turanian Indo-European cultures with Kurgan culture in the field of the Great Mother, civilization of Great Mother. Speaking about Dionysus in the previous lecture, we have identified that Dionysus is the main problem of this civilization and that is the battleground where there is titanomachia developing.

I have mentioned as well, the case of Thracian people. Thracian people were people of Turanian type first of all, Indo-European people that came to the Balkans before the Slavs (maybe 1200 years before Christ, maybe a little bit later, maybe earlier. It's difficult to say). What is important is that was a kind of empire of the Thracian tribes. Many Thracian tribes lived in the Northern Balkans but they occupied almost the huge part of the Eastern Europe. What is important is that these territories where the Thracian civilization was based and was expanded were the poles and the centers of the civilization of Great Mother. Lepenski Vir, Vinča culture, Karanavo Gumelnița culture, Cucuteni–Trypillia, Criș, Tisza culture, and all other cultures were under existential horizon of Thracians. We don't know and we could know whether the Thracians were the first Indo-Europeans coming over these territories but we don't know the more ancient groups (Indo-European). Maybe and possibly (probably) there were the other waves of Turanian people coming there. Maybe not. We could not say. But Thracian culture was precisely the field or special European culture where this meeting between horizon of Apollo and Logos of Apollo and Logos of Cybele was accomplished. So that was the culture of meeting. And Slavic tribes that came much later in the Balkans have assimilated and included these Thracian elements inside of their structure. As well, there is a very important aspect that Dionysus was considered by the Greeks to be Thracian God. Whether that was really Thracian or pre-Thracian or by some Indo-European people that preceded Thracian in the Balkans, we don't know. But that is very important that Dionysus came from the North to the Greece, from the Thracian, as well as Orpheus. As well as Bendis, Bendis was Thracian goddess very popular in Greece. The festival mentioned by Plato in "Republic" dedicated to her was Bendideia. The other goddess of Thracian origins was Kotys. Orgiastic festival dedicated to her

was called "Cotyttia". Phrygians as well were close to Thracians and Phrygian civilization was the people where the Cybele cult was developed. That as well has something to do with Thracian world.

It is possible that Thracian tribes were more ancient than we presume and maybe they were the first, or maybe not. We could not affirm. But what is certain is that they were Indo-European society with very developed nomadic aspect and more to the north, more nomadic they were, more to Transylvania, to Romania that was already the steppes of Eurasian, Turanian space. But what is certain is that Thracians were here around Danube River and basin and in Balkans long before Scythians and Sarmats. So that is very ancient Indo-European culture that has assimilated and included the paleo-Indo-European tradition directly or by intermediary by some other Indo-European society. We could not say anything affirmative here but what is important is that regarding the Slav horizon of Eastern Europe that dominated Eastern Europe as civilization after 5th and 6th century when the Eastern Europe was invaded by Slavs, before the coming of Slavs, the Thracian civilization was here. And that was Indo-European. And maybe the meeting between Logos of Apollo and Logos of Cybele was precisely in Thracia. And the other important is that if so, European peasantry expanded from the same region. The Balkan space was the motherland (Urheimat) not only for Eastern European peasantry but for all European peasantry, because the agricultural tradition was developed much earlier, precisely in the fertile territories of Balkans, where this matriarchal society existed, long before coming of Turanian culture.

Eastern Europe that is considered to be periphery or border or something marginal to Greece or afterwards to Western Europe, maybe was central one. So we need to consider more this Eastern European space as existential space. We need to pay more attention to this Eastern European Dasein and existential horizon of Eastern Europe. It is complex with many tribes, many people, and many levels of the culture but what is very important is the Thracian origins of Dionysus and Orpheus. In the perspective that I have explained about the central role of the figure of Dionysus as a key to the historical sequence of European history, to ontology of European history, the Eastern Europe obtains new dimension and new importance. It was not in the reality, periphery of the other Greek, Roman, later Western European civilizations. That was something polar in Eastern Europe, in Balkans, that was kind of center and pole. But the quality and the noological nature of this pole, we need to study more. So not only to be proud to be Balkanian Slavs living here after Thracians, but what is important is to understand the structure and the levels to noology of this space. Because the problem of Dionysus is central and so important as I have tried to explain, the role of Eastern Europe is growing. We could deduce from that, one important thing. We could deduce that we know Eastern Europe (Thracian, Slavic, Balkanic space) as a kind of continuation or result or periphery of the Western Europe and Eurasia, Russia, or Turanian space. But there is absolutely new Dionysian kind of Eastern Europe where this meeting that is key event in the ontological and semantical history of the Western Europe was produced. So Eastern Europe is not the periphery but is in some way the center and the pole, in very special way. Regarded as such, we need to concentrate more on the motherland of Dionysus because it is precisely the motherland of Dionysus. And the factor of Thracian language and Thracian culture and the only pure Thracian God, Zalmoxis, that is known, we need to pay more attention to this figure. There are many parallels and common aspects between Zalmoxis and Dionysus. Mircea Eliade and Romanian tradition paid great attention to the figure of Zalmoxis and its role in the Thracian horizon. So Thracian

culture as well as matriarchal culture before Thracians, the civilization of Eastern European Great Mother didn't disappear. It entered into the peasant Eastern European tradition and expanded with the peasantry through all of Europe. Where we have the peasants in Europe, we have the continuator, the descendants from the Balkanian motherland.

So we could speak about peasant Dasein, a special kind of third function that conserved cultural lines of pre-Indo-European tradition. One of the first pre-Indo-European societies that integrated these elements were Thracians. And after them were all the other. Maybe we should pay special attention to Illyrians as well because they lived here in the Western Balkans with Thracians. And according to some historians, the space of Illyrians reached to the Baltic Sea. Maybe Illyrians lived as well far to the north before Slavs came there. But we know too little about these two people but we could deduce some things starting interpreting correctly Southern Slavic tradition because there is cultural continuity. Because all the peasants we know, maybe after the thousands of years of Indo-Europeanization, they were originally Balkanic. Peasantry is Balkanic and peasant Dasein and peasant tradition is in the roots, in the depth, Balkanic. So that is very important.

Now we could consider European space and to say some words about different lesser existential horizon of the great European space. As we have said already, there is the huge Indo-European Turanian space that includes almost all Eurasia, from the British Isles to India. That is the greatest Indo-European existential horizon. There is European existential horizon of the Western but European that includes as well Eastern Europe. But we could as well change the scale of noology and geosophy and try to consider the lesser scale. But now we know what we are seeking. We are seeking how each society solved or is solving the problem of Dionysus. Now our search is much more concrete. Trying to understand or decipher or interpret hermeneutically, one or other European culture, we are searching the noological balance and the moment of noomahia in any society.

For example, starting with Greek tradition, Greek tradition is based on the absolute victory of the Logos of Apollo. But this victory as I have mentioned yesterday was not immediate. Hellenistic tribes (Aeolian, Ionian) came to the Balkan and the Peloponnese in waves controlling or overcoming the existing matriarchal civilization. But at the same time there was exchange of the elements. Some Greek territories conserved this Indo-European vertical tri-functional purely patriarchal structure and some have lost it or some elements. So we had Minoan and Mycenaean cultures where there was the mixture between patriarchy and matriarchy elements. And only the last wave of the Hellenic tribes coming from the north, from Macedonia, Dorian wave, the fourth Hellenic tribe, brought with itself decisive Apollonism, decisive pastoralism and destroyed Mycenaean culture and introduced the purely Turanian style. That was very important. That is reflected in the Sparta. It is more Dorian than Ionian Athens. And the dualism of Greek culture between Sparta and Athens is that Athens was Ionian and Sparta was Dorian. And that was as well the dualism of the balance of noomahia because in Sparta, the Logos of Apollo was clearer and more powerful. And in Aeolia and Ionia, in Athens, in the Anatolian Greek colonies, the power of this vertical Logos of Apollo was lesser. That is important that in Greece as well there were the kind of differences of existential horizons. And the dualism between Sparta and Athens is the key dualism in the geopolitics, as well has noological and geosophical interpretation and explanation.

Dionysus was Greek God as well with Thracian origins, but it was purely Greek because around him there was Apollonian perspective and very ancient Cybelian space. And in Greek culture, in the worship, in the polytheistic religion, and in philosophy, we see this element very clearly. I would like to mention that I have already said that could be the Logos. All three of them could be reflected in the religion and in the myth but as well in the philosophy. The Logos of Apollo is reflected in the perfect, almost absolute best way in the Platonic philosophy. Platonic philosophy is the absolute version of Logos of Apollo, as well as logic of Aristotle that was the disciple of Plato. In part of Aristotle's teaching we as well see the Logos of Apollo in the purest and formalized version. There was the Logos of Dionysus in Heraclitus that is dialectic. That is as we have called that dramatic nocturne. That is Heraclitus philosophy that is based on the cycle, on the war, on this dialectic between eternal and what is in time. But that is not materialist. Heraclitean belongs to the Dionysian aspect. As well the part of the teachings of Aristotle of physics and rhetoric belong as well to Dionysian Logos because they are dealing with a paradox of two-in-one, a form and matter in one thing. The thing is double and is one. That is not Apollonian. Apollonian is 'one is one. That is that and not the other.' If there is something that is 'that is that and the other' we are already shifting to Dionysus. So that is the great error to consider the physics of Aristotle as the logic of Aristotle. There are two visions in Aristotle. There is Apollonian side of Aristotle that is logic. And there is Dionysian side of Aristotle that is physics. And what is interesting is we are dealing with completely erroneous understanding of Aristotelianism because we are trying to apply logic to physics. We are working with physical mathematical object. There is not such object in the reality. There is mathematical object that is purely Apollonian and there is physical object that is purely Dionysian.

From that follows a very important remark. In order to study the physical world, we need to apply not the logic to this world but rhetoric. Rhetoric will be more strict science and more precise science of the physics. We need to use Heraclitean concept of dialectics and rhetorics. Rhetorics is a kind of violation of the law of the logic. In rhetoric, we are saying the things that don't correspond exactly to what we pronounce. That is irony. Irony is the main figure of rhetoric. Irony is when we are saying one thing and are meaning the other thing. For Slavs it's very clear. Our language is rhetoric and ironic. We are living in an ironical culture. We never say what we mean. We say one thing and mean another and make a third and the result is fourth. That is classical rhetorical ironical society. We are ironical people. All our speech is based on irony. But irony is the main figure of the rhetorics. So irony is violation of the laws of logic. For example, metonymy; metonymy is the figure that we say as how many 'heads of cattle' we have but we mean cows or bulls or sheep and not the 'heads' of them. But we are using the part as the whole as rhetoric. But it is violation of the logic. We are counting heads. And all rhetoric figures are such. We are saying one thing and meaning something other. Synecdoche and anti-phrase and all the other rhetoric figures cover the physical reality exactly. But logically we could not gain such precision just because the physical object could not belong to the intellectual object or mathematical. There is not physical mathematical. With logic we could study mathematical and geometrical objects but physical objects we should study with different rhetorical method. And only this rhetorical method could be strict and precise enough to cover the dialectical structure of the object. The thing is rhetorical and not logical. That's very important.

I suggest reading of early texts of Heidegger about Aristotle as well as Aristotelian studies of early Husserl and Brentano because the phenomenological tradition in philosophy stressed this Aristotelian aspect ignored by the previous tradition. Phenomenologists have rediscovered this Aristotle. There was as well in Greek existential space, the third logos (logos of Cybele), represented philosophically and not only in the mystery of Great Mother. This philosophical tendency of Ancient Greece was represented by Democritus and by Epicurus and in Rome by Lucretius. These three authors were typically representatives of ancient materialist and immanentist tradition because for them there were no patriarchal principles and everything consists from atoms. They professed (above all Epicurus and Lucretius) the concept of progress that says everything is going in the positive way from the lesser to the better, from the evil to the good. That was the concept that everything was growing from the bottom to the top. The concept of the progress, of evolution is purely titanic. That was materialistic titanic version of the cosmos. Three Logos were present in Greek philosophy but what is important is normative Logos were considered to be Logos of Apollo (Platonism and partly Aristotle) and Heraclitus (Dark Logos but as well accepted). Democritus and Epicurus (in the lesser scale) were rejected. Plato suggested to burn the book of Democritus because that was considered a very dangerous heresy and philosophy could be as well heresy. Now we see clearly, that was the continuation of Indo-European titanomachy or noomahia and the moment of Greek culture of noomahia was based on the victory of the Logos of Apollo with the friendship and alliance of Logos of Apollonian Dionysus over this materialistic Cybelian Logos. That is more or less, in some words, an explanation of Greek tradition. And inner dualism was represented in the dualism of Sparta and Athens.

What is important is that is Hellenistic time. Many things were changed during Hellenistic times after Alexander the Great. During Alexander the Great, Greece had expanded its control over completely new existential horizon. That was Iranian existential horizon. That was included in the Mediterranean and Greek culture. And that created the phenomenon of Hellenism. Hellenic is one thing and Hellenistic is other thing. Where lays the difference between two cultures and existential horizons? Hellenic is Greek as we have explained. Hellenistic is Greek plus not Orient, not Eastern, not Asian, not Semitic as we usually say, but precisely Iranian existential space. So it is not vague or something Orientalistic. Hellenism is regarded as Greek plus something Oriental. If we study correctly this phenomenon of Hellenistic civilization, we discover very important thing - that Hellenism is strictly Greece plus Iran, and not Greece plus Egyptian, Semitic, Eastern, Indian, in the general sense. It is Iranian because Iranian civilization was not only the culture of Iran. That was culture of Achaemenid Empire that included in itself as well Egypt Semitic tradition and transformed in its Iranian Logos, all these ancient cultures. There was the common denominator in this Achaemenid cultural tradition and existential horizon. All that I have explained in my book *The Logos of Iran*, Iranian Logos. Iran has included all the previous cultures and transformed in the context of its own dominating Zoroastrian Mazdean concept. So we are dealing with Egypt, with Semitic world, with Babylonia, after Achaemenid Empire, not directly but through Iranian concept. They were Iranized. What we are calling Egyptian, Semitic, Babylonia in the reality were Iranized version of this tradition.

So I suggest to distinguish Iranian and Iranistic as we are distinguishing Hellenic and Hellenistic. So Achaemenid Empire was not purely Iranian but that was not exclusively Iranian but was inclusively

Iranian. That included the other traditions but transformed them semantically in the context of Iranian Logos. In Hellenism, that was a kind of heir, and Alexander of Macedonia has received the heritage of this Iranism in full scale because the Empire of Alexander (Hellenistic Empire) was the same as Achaemenid Empire plus Greece. But that heritage is almost always ignored. They say 'Alexander of Macedonia has received Oriental heritage and not Iranian' because we consider this acquisition of the new territories and conquests of Alexander the Great with Greek eyes. In that sense, we Europeans (Russians, Serbians, French, Germans) are all Greeks because for us, Greek history is our history and Iranian history is the history of other. Never do we consider Iranian history as our history. So that was conquest of us against them. And they were not so clearly distinguished. So we should overcome them, include their cultures, but we don't go into the details of what we have acquired. They were conquered culture. But if we consider that in the perspective of Iranians, everything changes. There was a kind of Iranian Logos. And what was the essence of Iranian Logos that we should include in our understanding of European civilization because of Hellenism. And I will explain why Hellenism is so important.

Iranian Logos is based on the main principles; first of all that is the war of light. That is, as we have said yesterday, radical dualistic Platonism. It is the Logos of Apollo against the Logos of Cybele but recognizing the power and the substance and the autonomous nature of this second Logos. So that is not only as in Advaita Platonism, as non-dualist Platonism, which the darkness is the absence of light. No. The darkness in Iranian concept is a living thing, is powerful thing, and is winning thing. For Plato, to suggest that the evil can win against the good is absurd. It's absolutely impossible. Because in the world of Apollo and Logos of Apollo, there is the eternal victory of the light over darkness and darkness doesn't exist. In dualist Iranian version, darkness exists and darkness is God but the other God. The night is powerful and the night can win. The fight between them is for the first time comparing to the Platonism and the Logos of Apollo is serious and something dramatic, something that you can lose. That is completely different attitude toward life. That is Apollonian. To be Iranian is to be the bearer of light for Iranians. There is no other definition of Iranian. Iranian is the son of light put into the field of the darkness in order to fight. So that's extremely dramatic version of Logos of Apollo with recognition of the substance, the reality, and the power of the Logos of Cybele. It is Iran purely.

In Iranian self-consciousness, Iranian identity is based on the concept that only Iranians are pure, the people of light and all the rest, including Turanians, are people of darkness. So that is a kind of metaphysical racism in Iranian tradition; purity. And that was the situation of the permission of the incest. Incest is strictly prohibited in any kind of culture primitive or developed but not in the Iranian. Because the concern to conserve the purity of the Iranian soul, Iranian body, and Iranian blood was so great that it outweighed the prohibition of the incest and the marriage between the sister and brother or son and mother. That's almost incredible in archaic society and developed society but in Iranian society, that was permitted. That was almost obligation in order to save this purity of the son of light. So that is extreme version of Logos of Apollo. But that is Iranian tradition. But Iranism included Egyptian, Semitic, Babylonian, and other people. So that was not so much exclusive as Iranian. Iranism is a kind of symbolical transfer of this quality of son of light, not from the direct Iranian bodily concrete material (in some way) understanding of what is the light and what is the son of the light as a kind of metaphoric son

of light. So Iranism is not Iranian. It is not so exclusive. It embedded in itself the other traditions. The concept of war of light is accepted in the broader sense.

After that, the other concept of Iranian tradition that wasn't known by the Greek society is the idea of time and the idea of history. In the Platonic version, there is no history and there is no time as something important. There is always just the same, the cycle of the birth and the death, of the same. That is eternal return of the things. That is purely Platonic with no reason, with no development, with no progress, and with no regress. There is completely different time. You come from the source and you return to the source. That's all. And what is going on in these sublunar cycles has no matter, no knowledge, no sense, no direction, no time, and no history. So there is the history of eternity. The Platonic history is the history of eternity and the time is reflection of eternity so it doesn't exist in the sense that is common to us. But only in Iranian tradition, the time obtains meaning because Iranian tradition affirms that in the beginning there was the light over darkness. And the second stage of Iranian historical sequence, the darkness has interrupted and has invaded the realm and field of light and began to destroy and deviate and pervert the world of light. In the next moment, the darkness will overcome the light and will win the light. At the end of the rule of the darkness, there will be the great restoration, resurrection, and appearance of the chosen one that will be the king and the savior of humanity (Saoshyant). So there appears the time because now the time matters. In Plato, the time doesn't matter. It's nothing. There is no logic. And here appears the history. Here appears the time and the eschatology. Here appears messianism, the messiah. Here appears the last king of the world that should appear and restore the realm and the kingdom of light as the last result of the fight of the war of light. And there is resurrection of the lost perfection of the creation of light. That is Iranism. But we are dealing with that as something completely close to us. But all that was completely unknown to the Greeks. It is purely Iranian influence; history, time, resurrection, eschatology, and the meaning of the time. In Greek Platonic world, the time has no meaning at all. Only return to the origin has meaning. The time and the history is nothing. There is only the example of the past heroes in order to repeat that. The heroes of the past are functioning as paradigms, as ideas. And here appears the history. Here manifests itself the completely new Iranian perspective and after conquests of Alexander the Great, that spiritual philosophical and metaphysical heritage entered into the Mediterranean Greek culture. That which was outside became inside.

There is a kind of idea that the time, the messianism, and the history were all brought by Semitic Jews by the Bible. But we know the Bible only after Babylonian captivity. In Babylonian captivity and the end of Babylonian captivity, there was the Achaemenid Empire that distributed this Iranian Logos including among the Jews. The late Judaism that we know and that is linked with the concept of Messiah, of the end of time, and resurrection is some Iranian redaction of the purely Semitic original Judaism. The time and the history was Iranian and was Hellenistic. Hellenism is so important for European culture and for any European existential horizon because it is precisely based on two conceptual pillars and not on one. It is not the Greek Hellenic culture and something Oriental or Semitic. It is Greek and Iranian. Hellenism is Iranism at the same time. And Hellenistic culture and Hellenistic world was precisely the existential space that created Hellenistic Dasein. Hellenistic Dasein was the basis of European culture of the next stage. What is important is first of all; this Hellenistic space and Dasein had changed the ruling point.

That was the shift from the Greek domination to the Roman domination. But the Ancient Rome was as well something like the Logos of Apollo in Italy. But the conquests of Rome of the Mediterranean space was the conquest of the Hellenistic world. And that was as well the shift from the Roman to the Roman Empire and the late Republic as well because that started long before the Empire. After the victory over Greeks, there was the beginning of the change of the Roman culture. Roman culture we know is Hellenistic Rome. But Hellenism is Greek plus Iranian. So Roman Mithraism and many other aspects were taken from these Hellenistic sources. And this Greco-Roman Iranian Hellenism, in Roman version, expanded to the northern Western Europe, to the Balkans. Roman conquests in the cultural dimension were Hellenistic. The Roman soldiers brought Hellenism everywhere they came to.

What was Hellenism? Hellenism, once more, was Logos of Apollo in Greek Platonic tradition, Logos of Dionysus in Greek mysteriosophic and as well Heraclitean tradition, Logos of Apollo in Iranian version, in dualistic version with time, with concept of war of light, with Messiah eschatology, and no Logos of Cybele. The Logos of Cybele was present in the depth of this existential space but was not represented clearly. Only maybe in some Pergamon, in some history of the sibyl's prophecy and to put the black stone of Cybele from Phrygia to Rome but that was more or less marginal. There was a kind of matriarchal cult in Roman Hellenistic Empire but they were not dominating. The dominating culture was Apollonian, Greek Apollonian, Iranian Apollonian, and Greek Dionysian. But precisely this Hellenism was Roman Empire culture. And that was Christianity, because Christianity was constructed over this space. And that has logical continuation of the same culture, Christianization of the Hellenism in Greco-Roman version. Iranian aspect in Christianity was crucial. But now we see this Roman Hellenism with domination of Logos of Apollo. That was conserved with some aspect of Dionysian culture up to Modernity. The Latin Logos, the Roman Empire Logos, is Hellenistic, is Roman in its deepest aspect, but Hellenistic and Greco-Iranian in the next level. And that was with some aspect of dualism that in Roman culture was more accentuated than in Byzantine Christianity. St. Augustine was Manichean in his youth. Manichaeism is a form of Iranism and Iranism is dualism, and so on. So there is something Manichean and Iranistic in Rome a little more than in Byzantine where there is much more Dionysian balance, or not dualistic Platonism in Byzantine Orthodoxy and dualistic Platonism in Roman Latin Catholicism. Nevertheless the Roman Catholic Empire was based on the Logos of Apollo with more dualism and maybe less Dionysian but at the same time purely Indo-European. And that was the destiny of Italy up to the last time. Conservation of this Logos of Apollo was a kind of moment of noomahia for Italy, to be the place where Rome was, to be the center of the Roman Empire, to be invaded by the German Indo-European tribes, to create a new state, but stay true to this Christian (in Catholic version) source to this kind of Christianized Hellenism up to the end.

The last form of this, in the very Modernized and perverted way, was the Italian Fascism. That was continuation of this Apollonian attitude. It was vertical hierarchy in the modern version. But that was the kind of straight line. Italian Fascism was the last sound of the See. Before that was the Trident Council where the Catholicism refused to go in the Protestant way. Defense of this Catholic identity or Apollonian Roman identity was the kind of destiny of the Italian existential horizon. That was not only caricature in the Fascism. There was absolutely a caricatural aspect of Roman tradition in Fascists as

everything in Modernity is a caricature but at the same time there was something logical and continuation of this Roman tradition in very special way, but continuation and defense.

The next existential of Europe is France. That is Celt tradition. What is particularity of Celt existential horizon? It is the power of the feminine principle, the power of Mother. Celt tradition has fresh roots of matriarchy. So the Celt Christianity was much more feminist friendly. There are many legends and myths about the island of mothers. The death was considered to be feminine. Maybe partly the tradition of the knights of Middle Ages with the cult of love was based on these Celt traditions. There is Denis de Rougemont, the very interesting author that tries to study the sources. Denis de Rougemont has written the book that is called *Love in the Western World* where he studied the sources and the roots of the tradition of glorifying love in the knight's culture in the Middle Ages. That was as well Celt influence with very strong presence of Great Mother. I gave the name for the book on French culture, *The French Logos: Orpheus and Melusina*. Melusina was the name for the fairy that was female dragon in Celt mythology. Orpheus as well was the figure (Thracian by origins), very important for French culture and Celt culture because the idea to go down to the center of the Hell in order to meet with the feminine principle that resides in the center of the Hell is the kind of destiny of the French culture in best aspect and the worst aspect. That was a kind of journey to the center of the earth in order to discover the femininity, the mother.

German Logos was quite different from Celt. It was heroic, it was warrior, and it was Apollonic. And that was the fight, a little bit as in Iranian case, against the Chthonic power. That is everlasting fight. To be German is the same as to fight. The German fights against the serpents, against dragons, against everybody else around. That is paranoid type (if we remember Gilbert Durand) of culture, but strongly patriarchal and with anelygynia relations with valkyries. So German women are more like German men. They are the same. They are fighting. They are Brunhildas. That is a kind of heroic society and destiny is the fight against titans. But when the Germans follow their destiny, they fight so sincerely that they could not remark the moment when their fight becomes titanic itself. They fight so much and are so devoted to the fight that it overcomes some natural limits and overcoming the natural limits is something titanic. So they begin to destroy themselves and to destroy everybody else around them. In Hitler, the titanic aspect of truly Germanic spirit is clear. That was good idea to create Great Germany but that was not so good idea to destroy everything and afterwards Germany itself with this over-measure. There is the Greek term 'hubris' that means absence of measure. So if for example you kill the enemy in the fight, that is good for heroic ethos. But if you violate, for example, his child in order to continue this, that is hubris. That happens but that is not considered to be too much heroic, or rape of the women, which is as well always a part of the war. But that is hubris. Maybe in the certain situation hubris and in the other not, but there is overcoming natural borders. In the German case, we see this warrior spirit, purely Apollonian, that sometimes overcomes its borders and the enemies of the titans become titans themselves. So they're trying to overcome the other and they change their roles in the history. So being fighters of the sky against the earth, they begin to fight the earth in chthonic way.

There was very important idea in Iranian tradition that the army of light is weaker than the army of darkness. And the defeat of the army of light is necessary element of resurrection and the final victory. That is very metaphysical aspect. So in order to win, you should undergo defeat with the light. If the light

should die, it's better to die with the light than to win with the darkness. So the force is not the last word. The last word is the truth or the light. So the idea is that when we pass over some measure, some borders, some limits, and if we fight too much we could destroy everything. That is German destiny and that is German Logos. In the case of Protestantism, in the beginning, that was very important idea that Christ is something inner, not only outer, not only belonging to the cult, and not only going from outside. Christ comes from within. That was the original idea of Protestantism. And Platonism and German mystics (Meister Eckhart) were inside at the center of the early Protestantism. But without measure, being brought to the hubris in titanic way, that becomes something completely different; the individualism, rationalism, absence of mystery, absence of humility in front of God. That was heretic Arianism. It was a kind of return to the Arianism. That was the Protestantism that was as well German, in the best and the worst aspects. Protestantism is titanic version of Christianity because Catholicism and Orthodoxy are Apollonian version of Christianity. But modern Protestantism (Calvinism above all) and the radical versions of Protestantism are not Christian. They are titanic versions.

So England and the British horizon - when I studied British history, I have arrived at the conclusion that I could not call the book dedicated to the English 'The English Logos' because I didn't find the English Logos. But I have discovered a profound duality of English culture. There was the Celt pole represented by Welsh, by Ireland, and by Scotland that is part of the Celt world and Celt existential horizon. This is part of the France in some way with the same fascination with the feminine principle, with the same descent to the Hell, with the same black romanticism and so on. And Celt part is not only Irish or Scottish. That was as well in Wales and inside of English society. The Stuart Dynasty was Celt. The Celtic elements are inside of English identity. They are not outside. Outside are the radical aspects in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. But the majority of the population of the British Isles were Germanized Celts. The other pole is German.

So the mixture of Celt and German elements didn't create a new Logos or new existential horizon. It created English schizophrenia and bipolarity. There is a kind of unbalanced mixture between German and Celt that was not a kind of synthesis. That was a very ill mixture or confusion of contradictory elements. They didn't create a united Logos. They didn't create a united identity. They created a bipolar society which was very very troubled inside. And there is the other example of the relations between Celt and German identity in Switzerland, Belgium, and all the heritage of Lothair, the third heritage of Charles the Great. And in Switzerland there is very very thin balance between both identities. There is not so much synthesis but there is harmonization. And what we see in England is absolutely disharmony, absence of any harmony. There is very aggressive German part and very depressive Celt part. They don't form the whole, something holistic, something internal. They formed bipolar entity with deep conflict inside that could not be resolved internally so it expanded as British Empire. It was expanded as a kind of explosion of these two contradictory identities that didn't create a Logos. It created British Empire of capitalism, imperialism, and liberalism. If French Celt Logos, for example, is much more Dionysian with many aspects of the black Dionysus and German Logos is Apollonian with possibility to change the situation to the titanic aspect, English culture and identity took the black Dionysus and titanic aspect of German Logos, united them in very conflictual way and expanded over the planet. That was a kind of not colonialism but colonization of illness that wasn't cured inside and couldn't be cured. That is manifested

in the main myth of England - the fight of two dragons; the red dragon and white dragon. That was the beginning of the history of England. The red dragon represents Celt identity and white dragon represents German identity. And these two dragons are still fighting. And the explosion of British Empire didn't change anything and didn't cure English mind. English mind rests ill and bipolar but now it is obliged to return to this fight that never ends. That is very interesting idea. There is no Logos. In France we could identify the Logos. In Germany we could identify the Logos. We could identify the Logos in Italy, Greece, and other countries but not in England.

There is a kind of North American Logos. South American is the continuation of the Latin Logos with Apollonian structure. That was embedded in the pre-European population not without the problems but that was a synthesis. And Anglo-Saxons brought to North America their illness. They began to destroy the Indians and not integrate them into their society. And they created an absolutely ill North-American society as continuation of the same problem. But there is a kind of American Logos in pragmatist philosophy. There is a kind of solution for them. Pragmatism is the main trend in North-American philosophy. What is Pragmatism? It is the idea that there is no normative knowledge about subject and there is no normative knowledge about object but there is only interaction in practice. If something works, it is. If something doesn't work, then maybe next time. There is no concept of what subject or object should be, of what should be matter, nature, cosmos, or human soul. We could pretend to be everybody; Elvis Presley, martians, Anglo-Saxon, everybody. If it works, so nice. If it doesn't work, it's bad for you. So we could treat the world in any way we want. So that is a kind of pragmatist freedom. That is why American philosophers tried to adapt Heidegger in their Pragmatist way. It's not Heidegger but it's American reading of Heidegger, precisely because they believe only in what is between, what is interaction, practical. For example, if you are constructing the time machine in order to return to the other time, you are free to do that because doing that, something could happen. Maybe not return to the time but you could discover some elements or some knowledge to sell something or new bottle for Coca-Cola. So you are completely free to do whatever you want because there are no limits of object or subject. There is no inner and no outer. It's only interaction. And interaction is practical and pragmatist, if it's good to you. That is American Logos. It's very special. It's not Anglo-Saxon. It is the other kind.

And now in globalist time, there is a kind of loss of this Logos, because America could not pretend to be colonialistic, because colonialism is the clearly defined goal. So now America is not anymore American. They are in the hands of some other groups. American Logos is not so. It is pragmatism that couldn't tolerate any goal. They could act and something happens or something doesn't happen and you could feel happy or not but you could try everything and you shouldn't prescribe to anybody nothing. Political correctness is anti-American and anti-Pragmatic. You can say everything and act how you like and make the monuments you prefer or not have any monuments at all because there is nothing inside or outside but only in the interaction. So that is pure American in best or worst. That is American Pragmatist Logos. Now North America is not such. It is different.

That is analysis more or less of the different existential horizons or cultural spaces of European civilization. I have already said some words about Slavs. We are Indo-European society. The last centuries, we are under great influence of the West. So partly we share with German, with French, with British, with Greeks, with Latins, their problems, having some special features. We will dedicate to

Serbian identity a special lecture so I don't want to anticipate too much. But what about our Slavic Logos? It is clearly a part of Hellenistic cultural space because all the other identities I have described are a kind of result of this Christian Hellenism in different combinations. But what is as well clear is that we do not have such Slavic Logos as something already made or something completed. It is the most interesting thing. That is challenge for us. That is open Logos. I have studied the possibility of the Russian philosophy basing on Heidegger in special book. I didn't yet write the last book of noomahia that will be dedicated to Russian Logos, possible or not. But dealing with Eastern European Slavic tradition, I see clear that the Slavic Logos is possible and some time in the history we approached it.

We were very close to it in the Dusan the Strong in your history, with the first and the second Bulgarian Kingdoms in the history of Bulgarians, we were close some time in the Polish Kingdom with Lithuanian and Great Moravia as well with some philosophical tendency. But we have never achieved the final version of this Logos in Eastern Europe, as well in Russia. We didn't achieve the final version of Logos. Our existential horizon is not finished. It hasn't received the last form. And that maybe is our historical challenge. And Slavophile thinkers saw that we came to the history later than the other when there was already a huge building of German philosophy, German political history, French philosophy, Roman philosophy, Greek philosophy, and as well political history. We Slavs have arrived to this a little later, not in the history, but to the understanding of history, to Logos of history, and to our philosophy. Our philosophy is a little bit childish and infantile. There is great example, great explosion of intellectual richness of precious thinkers such as Petar II Petrović-Njegoš metaphysical as well, Russian Dostoyevsky but all that is a kind of feeling of coming of our Logos and not the Logos itself. We are living in the anticipation of the Slav Logos. And when we study the past, we see many heroic deeds but we could not say that is our Logos. No. That is something like that. There is Saint Sava in Serbia. That's anticipation of the Serbian mission, of the history. The creation of Nemanja Dynasty, Russian Ivan the Terrible and the other moments in our Slavic history are anticipation of Logos and not the Logos itself. That's my personal opinion and it's more difficult to describe our own Logos than to study the Logos of the other because it demands very deep introspection inside in our culture.

But nevertheless we should recognize some centuries we were under the influence of the other existential horizons and they defined many things in our actual consciousness. But that is always scientific truth. We have conserved our identity and the core of our existential Slav horizon in the same condition. Maybe it is buried in the depth but it exists surely in the Serbian example of the resistance to globalization. It is one of the examples. Yes, that was the defeat but Kosovo struggle was as well defeat. But on this defeat is based the victory. On this defeat, on this capacity to resist is based the future resurrection. That is not only the death as defeat. That is heroic death. It's always promise of the resurrection. To say the truth, I constate very pessimistic state in modern Slav society but at the same time, I'm very optimistic concerning the possibility of this Logos. It is not yet done or completed. But that is the challenge for new generations of Slav intellectual elite that should bring to the final point all the historical experience, all this historical (not historic) sequence of our ontological presence in the world. I think that we should study the cultures of other European people. We should study in depth these existential horizons to understand where we are and who lives around us, with whom we have to deal, who are oppressors, who are saviors, friends, and enemies but most importantly to understand

who we are. But without knowing who are the other, we could not define ourselves. In knowing the other, we know ourselves. In knowing ourselves, we know the other. So in order to establish or re-establish or discover this Slavic Logos, we need to study as well, the Logos of and geosophy of European world, Indo-European world and the other people. That is the importance of noomahia.

Introduction to Noomakhia (lecture 7) Christian Logos

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The seventh lecture is dedicated to Christian Logos. So now we are going to make a short Noological analysis of Christianity and Christian tradition. I would like to say that, that is not dogmatic. We are regarding Christianity as cultural, social, political, structural, philosophical phenomenon. So we don't defend or accuse Christianity, being I presume mostly Orthodox Christian as myself, we are going to treat Christianity in the correct way but not insisting too much on our confessional preferences. That is a kind of Noological analysis. We don't discuss the truth or heresy or what was accepted as dogmatically correct or heretic. Everything we are going to speak of will be regarded from the Noological point of view, the structural analysis.

First of all, when we consider Christianity and Christian doctrine from a Noological point of view, basing on geosophy and basing on the Three Logos, we could easily, from the very beginning, formulate some general principles concerning Christianity. First of all, the Logos of Christianity is clearly Apollonian. First of all, that is verticality. And the concept of God the Father, the Heavenly Father, the Holy Trinity, and the transcendence of the Creator in front of creation all creates a kind of traditional Logos of Apollo that we already know. That is pure vertical organization of the metaphysical space. There is the Heavenly Father (Father not Mother) that is in the Heaven, that is in transcendence, that has created the world. So that is a kind of coming down from top to down. Creation is from eternity to time, from Heaven to the earth, from God to the man and the other creatures. There is purely Apollonian logic in basic dogmatical principles. All three person of Holy Trinity are considered to be male, masculine. That's very important. God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. All three are considered as male figures. That in the symbolical way is very important. The relation between the creature and the creator are hierarchical. The created things should be submitted to the creator. So that is a kind of hierarchy. And this verticality is the basic feature of Christian tradition. That is the essence of Christian tradition. That is patriarchal.

And affirming that, we could say that it is not the chance that this tradition has developed in the Indo-European world first of all (in Greece, in Rome, in Europe.) Christianity became a normative tradition for Indo-European society. Not for all but for Western part of Indo-European society where the concept of God and its main features of Christian God (Father) was more or less correspondent to Zeus, to Jupiter, to the male deities of pre-Christian time. In the popular consciousness it was easy to replace one Heavenly Father by another. Because the figure in German language is the word, 'Gestalt.' That is the

figure; the image that is not the precise person that we know its qualities. Gestalt is a kind of frame of Heavenly Father that was the same. So that was a kind of continuity from pre-Christian tradition and Christian tradition. It was a continuity that was based on the structure, on the frame, on Gestalt, on the typology of the civilization. So that is very important. We could see how Greeks, Latins, Germans, Celts, Slavs accepted one figure of Heavenly Father instead of the other. So that was a kind of transformation that didn't touch the structure of world vision of Indo-European people. So that is very important. There was a kind of continuity.

That was explained in the philosophy of some first Christian apologetics and saints, for example, Justin Martyr or Clement of Alexandria, that said that there were two branches of tradition, (not only Judaic tradition before Christianity.) There was as well Hellenic tradition. That was the second branch of that. And that was also sacred. But both Judaic tradition and Hellenic tradition in Christianity were transformed and were enlightened, were transformed into something more correct and more true, according to Clement of Alexandria and Justin philosopher. There was as well, in the first stages of elaboration of Christian doctrine, the concept that Christianity has two sources, not only Judaism but as well Hellenic (so Indo-European source). That was reflected above all in the Christian Platonism. Christian Platonism started first with the apostles themselves. Because the Gospel of John; "In the beginning was the Word." In the beginning was the Logos and the Logos is not the word only as we translate. The Logos is not only the word. It is intellect. It is Nous in some aspect. It is a very very complicated concept of Greek philosophy. The fact that we know the Gospels only in Greek, so they maybe were written in Greek and not translated from Aramaic, because the Greek was the Hellenistic koiné, the language that was distributed in the Mediterranean world because Christianity was born in Hellenism, in the Hellenistic context. Platonism begins not with exegetic tradition. It begins with the apostles themselves. Many aspects of Christian traditions from the very beginning was based on some Greek concepts because in Aramaic and Hebrew, there is no word equivalent to Logos, but that is the beginning of our Christian teaching. 'In the beginning was the Logos.' And we don't know the Aramaic Semitic word used for such concept. So with the beginning of Christianity, Christian theology was the Logos and Greek philosophy. That was developed later by Justin philosopher, Clement of Alexandria, and basically in Alexandrian school, with the great Origen, who was a Platonist. There was created the whole building of Christian theology, with the Holy Trinity, the transcendence of the creator and so on. Everything was based on Platonism, on the teachings of Plato. They say that Origen was the pupil, the disciple of Ammonius Saccas. Alexandria was Hellenistic. That was Egyptian in the traditional sense. That was Greek Hellenistic city. And there was Ammonius Saccas, who was the first teacher of Neoplatonism, of the so called fifth academy. He was the founding father of Neoplatonic tradition and Origen was his pupil. So that was the pure Platonic affiliation and continuity.

We have already spoken about the relations between the Logos of Apollo and Plato's teaching. They are almost the same. Platonism is the best and most accomplished, excellent, perfect expression of the Logos of Apollo. The elaboration of Christian dogmatism reflects this cultural continuity of pre-Christian

tradition and Apollonism was in the center of it. But we remark as well, in some Christian dogmas, Dionysian features. For example, there is the clear logic, pure celestial heavenly logic of Apollo in some aspects, but treating with Christology we are dealing with a Dionysian concept. Christ is the man and the God. So that is something Dionysian, something dialectical. There are two natures and one person in Christ. In the Holy Trinity, there is unity and trinity, so as well a kind of internal divine dynamic in that. And the relations of the creature and the Creator as well is something dialectic. The relations between them is not only the cause and the effect. They are intermingled. The God is present inside of creation and the incarnation of the Christ is the most important moment of the history of creation according to Christian doctrine, and that is Dionysian element that is embedded in the Christian dogmatic teaching. As well, Dionysian, Christ dies, resurrects, comes down to Hell to liberate the ancestors. He comes down and comes up and there is ascension in the Christian holidays and the saint moments, so He rises from the death and He still continues to go to the Heaven after that, after staying 40 days with the apostles. So there is pure Dionysian cycle. He comes down from Heaven to the earth. He dies and comes to the center of Hell. He destroys and wins the Hell. And after he liberates the saint souls of the ancestors and everybody goes to the common general resurrection with Christ, in the Easter, in this ascension moment, Christ returns to the Heaven, being the Son of God and ruling in the Heaven. So any aspects of this Christian narrative are purely Dionysian concerning Christ and purely Apollonian concerning the basic structure of the world which all these events are put in.

But what kind of Dionysian logic do we have? We have already said that in Indo-European tradition, the point of Dionysus is not exactly in the center between the Logos of Apollo and the Logos of Cybele. It is rather a bit higher than this dividing line. It is Apollonian reading of the figure of Dionysus and in the figure of Christ it is absolutely transparent, it's clear. So all chthonical, all negative aspects or dialectical, nocturnal aspects in the figure of Christ are not present. So that is purified Dionysus, Apollonian Dionysus. He is pure, immaculate. He has no sin. And coming to the center of the Hell to win the Hell and His power, He still rests God and absolutely pure. We are dealing with the normative, two figures of classical Indo-European structure. That is Indo-European religion with Indo-European theology, with the pure victory of the patriarchy over the Logos of Cybele. There is no sign of Logos of Cybele in this concept. And the Holy Virgin, the Mother of God is represented as Demeter much more than purely earthly figure. It is complete purification of the female nature. She's considered to be the head of the angels. It is the purity and virginity of the Holy Mother because she did not know the husband in the normal way, and she was bride of Holy Spirit, of God. So veneration of Holy Mother is purely Indo-European. It is the concept of the virgin, the heavenly celestial virgin and there is nothing chthonic in this image.

So all the principal figures of Christianity are Apollonian and Dionysian in the Apollonian reading of Dionysus. All these elements were present before Christianity, and not in the Semitic tradition. They were the basic concept of the Hellenistic world that was based on this alliance with Logos of Apollo with Logos of Dionysus. And in the periphery, there were some chthonic aspects in Hellenism, not

dominating, but they were present as the traces of the Great Mother culture. But in Christianity there were no such things. That was the pure formula, pure version of Indo-European Logos, restored to put in its brilliance, in absolute affirmation. And that is why Christianity became the tradition of the European West. In our cultures, our people have accepted Christianity because they were Christian before the Christ. So they were prepared for this revelation that was new, that was something completely different from the past, but there was the clear structural continuity. The existential horizon of Indo-European society was the same, was prepared, and was ready to receive the good news. So that is very important. In other civilizations, it is almost impossible to explain what is the Christ. It is universal but universal figure in the context of this Apollonian Logos. If the Apollonian and Dionysian Logos is present in other civilizations they could understand Christianity but it is not always the case and we need to make serious work to prepare the other cultures, the other existential horizons to Christianity. And in Hellenistic existential horizon, everything was ready to receive Christianity. That is very important.

Christianity is not our new tradition of the last 2000 years. That was continuation of the old Indo-European tradition. This structure with triads, trinity, everything was prepared. Not exactly because with any reform of religion, of mythology, of tradition, of the church, there are new elements but nevertheless the essence was the same. As well, for example, communion was the moment when the wine becomes the blood of God and the bread becomes the body of God. That is Demeter and Dionysus, prefiguration of it. So we could see prefiguration of Christ in the Old Testament that is completely legitimate. But as well we could see as Justin philosopher, Clement of Alexandria, or Origen, a kind of prefiguration of Christian mysteries in Greek mysteries, not exactly but a prefiguration, the images, anticipation of Christianity. And we have the same tri-functional tradition as Christianity. There are priests and patriarchs, there are kings and warriors, and there are peasants. So we have in the Christian society, all three Indo-European functions. And this structure of society lasted in the pure form up to the beginning of the Modernity, up to the end of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance. So, there is continuity as well in the social structure. There is continuity in Empire. There is some continuity in the rites, in the worship practice. So structurally, that was unity and continuity between pre-Christian Indo-European existential horizon and Christian existential horizon. So that is very important.

But at the same time, we see in the early Christianity, two very contradictory centers of elaboration of Christian doctrine. There is Alexandrian School and there is Antiochian School. Normally they say that everybody agrees about the philosophical and metaphysical quality of Alexandrian School founded by Saint Apostle Mark and developed by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Tradition of the Origenism came after to the Cappadocians; to Saint Basil the Great, Saint Gregory, and the other. And that was the dogma accepted in the first three Ecumenical councils. That was the kind of victory of Alexandrian School. And the conceptual axis of it was Neoplatonism, in different form. The highest point of Christian Neoplatonism is Dionysius the Areopagite and his works. That is pure Christian Platonism; the creation of nine orders of supernatural angels, powers, and all the Christian mysteries were explained in this Platonic symbolism. So there is clear Alexandrian tradition and that is one part of Christian teaching.

There is Antiochian School that gave many heresies, (such as Arius, Nestorius, and the others) that was opposed to Alexandrian School. And they say that was a kind of Semitic spirit orientated against Greek or Indo-European spirit. Alexandrian tradition was based on the symbolical allegorical reading of the Old Testament and New Testament and that is normal for Platonism. Plato's teaching regards everything that existed as symbol of the ideas. So everything should be read as symbolical text. Every thing, every event, every person should be regarded as an icon, as an image of the paradigm. (Hence the symbolical allegorical reading of Alexandrian School of any sacred text.) That is completely normal. And they say that in the case of the Antiochian School, that was a different approach; literal. And they say that is Semitic because it was not so much Greek with Platonism but that was historic. That was the history and that is sometimes called Judeo-Christian reading of Christianity. And we could say that Alexandrian School is Indo-European reading or Greek (Hellenistic) reading of Christianity. I thought the same before I had started to study it more closely. Because the Antiochian School was situated in Syria, Antiochia, that was considered where the main Semitic population was, it was considered to be Semitic. But starting to study the Antiochian School and the phenomenon of Judeo-Christianity that was opposed to Alexandrian School, and after writing the book on Semitic Logos (I have one volume of Noomahia dedicated to Semitic Logos, the Logos of Semites), I have discovered that that is not so.

Semitic Logos is quite different. It is based on a kind of Titanism of Baal in the pre-Judaic tradition. There was a very patriarchal version of the Eastern Semitic tradition of Akkadian and Assyrian in Babylonia that was similar to Hittite tradition or later to Iranian tradition. And there was Judaic tradition that was in some way anti-Semitic because the Judaic Logos (by traditional Judaism) was against all the people living in the Canaan (mostly Semites) with the cult of Baal, the Titanic deity that demanded bloody sacrifices of the children. And Judaism was absolutely opposed to it but not affirming something special. That was a kind of counter-identity. So the most anti-Semitic tradition historically was Jewish tradition, because that was opposed to any Semitic cultural horizon of Canaan. That was anti-Canaan in any senses. So, the Jews blamed all people living around them because they were supporters of Baal's cult. And they opposed to them, in the early stage of Jewish tradition, something very special. We could call that 'old God' because the Baal was considered by the most Semitic people as 'new God,' a kind of lesser God that didn't receive the heritage and has started a revolt against the 'old God,' So the mostly Semitic traditions, western Semitic traditions, were on the side of the new God Baal, with some Titanic Dionysian features. That was the black double of Dionysus (we have spoken about that). And the Jewish tradition was against this new God, against Baal, in favor of old God that was dethroned by Baal. But that had nothing to do with Christianity, not Baal nor old God. So Christianity was completely different.

In Antiochian School, I have found not this inter-Semitic drama of Western Semites (Assyrian, Aramean [not Jewish], and Jewish tradition) but something completely different. I have discovered there, Iranism in pure form. That was Iranistic tradition. And if we consider the late Judaism, the Judaism after

Babylonian captivity (so called Second Temple Judaism), we could easily identify in that, Iranian topics. That was a kind of original Judaic tradition transformed in the Zoroastrian Iranian context. Hence the concept of Messiah that was absent in the early Judaism, the history, the salvation, and the resurrection. All that appears during Babylonian captivity, in the late stage, in the second temple Judaism. So the late Judaism was Iranized form of Judaism and not so Semitic, in Jewish (originally Jewish) or not Jewish (other Semitic people) sense. That is very important. And Antiochian tradition was much more dualistic and Iranistic as well (not Iranian but Iranistic) because Semitic people, after the Achaemenid Empire, lived, including during the Hellenistic time, under great influence of Iranian Logos. And this dualism (in Manichaeism later) had all kind of Messianic tendencies, very similar to Christianity. That was the logical result of the concept of the war of light and the appearance of, at the end of the time, the figure of the last king and the savior. All that is, in our eyes, completely Christian or Jewish (in the late Judaism) but only in Iranian tradition does all that obtain the real metaphysical and structural meaning. All Iranian metaphysics explains why (because of the history, because of the war between the light and darkness.) So the Antiochian tradition was an Iranistic school.

We have in Christianity, a kind of world between the Greek advaita, non-dualistic Platonism (in the case of the Alexandrian School that we could call mostly Greek and Platonic) and we have Iranistic, dualist, historic version of it, which is not so much symbolic but historic in the sense of Messianism. But Messianism is not Jewish. Messianism is Iranian (metaphysically Iranian). So we have a kind of discussion or debate on the new stage between two Logos, both of them Indo-European, both of them vertical, both of them patriarchal, but with different editions. So that was the dialogue not between Judaism and Hellenism. That was the dialogue between Hellenism with Greek domination, and Iranism with Iranian dominations. All that was also the part of Christianity. In Christianity, in Christian doctrine, we have two poles. We could be more Platonic or more Iranistic and Messianic. And Judeo-Christianity is not Jewish spirit. It is Iranian spirit. Judeo-Christianity is Iranistic version of reading of Christianity.

That defines all history of Christian dogmatic councils. Of the first seven councils, the first three councils were victories of Alexandrian School over Antiochian School; over Arius in the first council, over Nestorius after that, and defeat of the Antiochian tradition that was much more inclined toward dualistic version. That is why Christ wasn't considered as God. He was considered as saint, as prophet, as the last savior, but not God, because there was a kind of difference, opposition between the material world and spiritual world. There is dualism, Nestorianism, and Arianism developed in the Antiochian Iranistic School, and spiritual Monism developed in the Alexandrian School. Both of them had heretic versions that were outside the Christian dogmatic orthodoxy. Antiochian School gave Arius and Nestorius and they were considered to be heresies. As well, the radicality of Alexandrian Platonism gave the other extremity; Monophysite heresy represented by the disciples of Cyril of Alexandria, Eutyches, and the others. So the Monophysite heresy was a kind of purely excessive Platonism (Greek version), and excessive Iranism (Nestorian version). They were heretical extremities of the legitimate orthodox point of view. The other parts of the Alexandrian School with the Cappadocians (Basil the Great, Saint

Gregory, and the other Cappadocian teachers), and the other part of the Antiochian School (Saint John Chrysostom who was representative of the Antiochian School) were considered to be absolutely orthodox. So there were heretic versions and there were completely orthodox versions of both of them.

And when they say that during Justinian that Platonism and Origenism were blamed (that is the fact) and considered to be heresy, it concerns only radical parts of this Platonism. For example, it didn't concern the teachings of Saint Basil the Great or Dionysius the Areopagite, who were accepted as orthodox authorities. Or for example, the excommunication of Nestorius didn't affect John Chrysostom who was considered a most orthodox figure in the Orthodox Church but he was representative of this historical (not symbolical) Iranian, Iranistic version of Christian doctrine.

The first three councils were victories of the Alexandrian School and the second three were a kind of revenge of the Antiochian School. After the end of the pure Antiochian School, the Antiochian School was destroyed and defeated but the tendency to moderate this Alexandrian neoplatonic version still existed. And the next three (the 4th, 5th, and 6th ecumenical councils) were a kind of victory of the Antiochian spirit because that was moderation of the pretensions of most radical representatives of Alexandrian School. That was a kind of balance. And that was a kind of victory of the Hellenism (but this time Christian Hellenism) where the two forms of Iranian and Hellenistic, historic and non-dualist, symbolic, all were united in the context of the orthodox dogma. And the seventh Ecumenical Council was not so important concerning metaphysics. That was about iconoclasm. (That had relations to this as well but not so directly.)

So, we have in Christianity, a continuation of the Mediterranean Hellenistic existential horizon with two poles (Iranistic and Greek poles.) And that was a kind of new form or new ideology of the traditional Indo-European horizon. We could say that there was a difference regarding the woman in Christianity. We see two approaches, as well very proper to Indo-European society. On one side there is a kind of 'anelygynia' that I'm calling. There is recognition of the full dignity of woman and a kind of spiritual equality between man and woman in Christ. There is the saying of St. Paul that 'there is no man, no woman but only Christ.' So that is a recognition of the dignity of the soul of woman that is equal to the soul of man. That is a kind of partnership, friendship, traditional Turanian friendship between the female warrior and male warrior in the defense of the identity. That is female warriors and male warriors as warriors of Christ. That is spiritual equality of the souls. At the same time, there was the second relation between man and woman that was a reflection of this coming of the nomadic Indo-European over matriarchal society where there was a kind of submission of the woman to the man. That was reflected in the other sayings of St. Paul, when for example women cannot teach in church, women should be submitted to the husband, and the others. That is hierarchy and equality, both versions of gender archetypes traditionally for Indo-European society in its historic relations with the matriarchal society. There is a kind of hierarchical submission and on the other level, a kind of friendship and equality and

spiritual dignity. That is a kind of best solution, a more organic and natural solution for the concrete historical society we are dealing with (not with the abstract.) In our tradition, how these horizons, spiritual and cultural spaces and civilizations were created during their historical and existential development that was the best solution that satisfied both demands of equality and hierarchy in a very concrete way. That was reflected in the Christian tradition. That was not casual. As Platonism was a reflection or expression of this Logos of Apollo, Christian tradition was an excellent and perfect reflection of this Apollonian, Dionysian style of civilization. That is the reason why we are Christians. We were not obliged to be Christians. We have accepted that as something that we knew before. That was a kind of remembrance of our identity. That is identity of Christian tradition that was recognized by the people of the Mediterranean, Hellenistic context because that was continuation of the same relations in the best way.

At the same time, we see continuity in empire because Christianity was accepted as religion and ideology of empire with Constantine the Great. There was developed a very important concept that is this time Iranian by its origin; the concept of Katehon (Greek name for 'that who supports.' Katehon is participle of Greek word κάτω έχου. κάτω is under, έχου is to have.) This figure appears in the second epistle letter of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, where there is concrete phrase; 'the son of perdition, the anti-Christ, will not come until the supporter, Katehon, (that who supports, who keeps) will be taken out of the way.' That was an enigmatic phrase. So, there is some figure that resists the coming of anti-Christ. Because there is a historical vision of Christianity, Messianic vision of Christianity, and that reflects not Platonic version of the eternity of the world, but dialectic of history that is Iranian. There appears some figure that fights against anti-Christ and that figure is key figure in the Iranian historical sequence, Iranian Logos. That is represented by the sacred emperor in Iranian tradition. In Iran, there is Iranian Kingdom and the sacred King of this Kingdom is that who fights the forces of the darkness and doesn't let them invade the world. That is a purely Iranian figure that didn't exist in the Greek concept. In the Greek idea, there was not such a figure. But in Roman ideology, in the Roman Empire there appears something like that, not so clearly defined, under influence of Iranian because Iranism was the part of the Hellenism and Hellenism was the main culture of the Roman Empire. That was a Latin empire. That was the Roman Empire that was based on the Hellenistic culture (we have spoken about that.) What is important is that this figure mentioned in St. Paul's 2nd letter to Thessalonians was identified clearly by Saint John Chrysostom (as well very important because he was representative of Iranistic branch of Christian theology, of the Antiochian School) but it is clear that before him as well, was identified as the figure of Roman Emperor.

So Katehon was the Roman Emperor, the King of the Empire. And there was theology of empire linked to the eschatology - the end of time, the resurrection, and the final apostasy. All the cyclic historic vision of the Christian Church was based on this figure (above all in Byzantium but not only Byzantium). In Byzantine Empire that was dogmatic ideology of Byzantines. In Byzantine existential space, in Byzantine culture, the Katehon was Emperor but Christian Emperor. He was considered to be a kind of Bishop of

the Church. So he was the key figure of the sacred King that fights against the coming of anti-Christ. And he was with the Patriarch. They made a kind of symphony (the term is from Christian Orthodox tradition), symphony of the powers. Symphony of the powers was based on the alliance between the Patriarch (the representative of the spiritual authority) and the Emperor (not normal king, nor knyaz, nor prince.) The Emperor was not only a secular ruler. The Emperor was the sacred figure of Katehon. He was linked to the historical cycle where there is empire with emperor as the head. There is no anti-Christ. We are living in the Christ's world. So, empire obtains with emperor a new dimension. It's not only a political organization. It is the sacred organization that is Christian, Apollonian, Dionysian (at the same time) version of organization of political reality as cosmic reality. Because the anti-Christ, the son of perdition (as in the St. Paul) is not only a historical person. It is manifestation of the darkness. It is manifestation of the cosmic, political, historical, metaphysical form. And dualism is not Christ against anti-Christ. That is completely artificial. There was not the case. Christ is God and was considered a God. He could not be put on the same level as anti-Christ. But emperor was the figure that was symmetric to anti-Christ. The Christian Emperor was the obstacle and the resistance and was a symbolic figure that united the Christian world and gave to it its vertical axis. That was a very important figure, continuing the same pre-Christian tradition.

But in Christian situation; empire, church, theology, patriarchy, dogmatic tradition, orthodoxy, all that forms the Christian Orthodox ideology as a new form of all elements that pre-existed, that existed before Christianity. That is very important. If we put together all these elements of verticality, of the Dionysian nature of Christ, of historical messianism of Iranism, and the figure of the sacred Emperor, we have in all that a full teaching that reflects not new teaching of Christianity but reflects the eternal moment of Noomahia of Indo-European society. At this time there was the figure of Satan that represented Chthonic forces or the Babylonian whore, the red Babylonian woman (Babel) that is the Great Mother in that context. That is the figure of Cybele (Babylonian, that was kind of close to Anatolia). Symbolically, we had all these Logos in Christian context. There is the scarlet woman (the great Babel, the Babylonian whore) that was a kind of figure of the Logos of Cybele. There is Satan or anti-Christ as a representation of Satan as 'Titan.' In some Christian texts they both were used, 'Titan' or 'Satan,' were considered to be very close. So that is a kind of serpent, dragon, dragon that is consort of the Great Mother (traditional). So they try to overthrow the Christian Empire that is under power of the spiritual figure of the Patriarch or Bishop and the sacred King Emperor. That was a reorganization of the Indo-European existential space in Christian time.

So we have a new ideology (Christian ideology), a new religion (Christian religion), and we have a very old tradition that was reflected in that. So Christianity was based on the victory over Satan. Satan was chained for a time being and put under the control of the Empire. The figure of Tsardom, Kingdom, the figure of Tsar and sacred King was a kind of seal, a kind of sigil (печать) over this victory of the Christian Church over Satan and Cybelian world. The situation was sealed with the King. So the King was seal. If we put together the seal, everything is destroyed and there is a kind of explosion because this Christian

Kingdom, Christian civilization, Christian society was constructed on the prison of Satan or the shoulder of the chthonic power, controlled and domesticated and submitted by the Logos of Apollo, chained in the Hell, but always alive. And when the King or the Emperor will become too weak (the subject of classical Iranian tale), he could not resist the appearance of the anti-Christ, anti-Christ will appear and Satan will liberate (liberalism) itself from the Hell in order to come to the human society. And that was explosion of the underground or a kind of return of Cybele with dragon as scarlet woman, as Babylonian whore with the serpent that should destroy the Kingdom, destroy the Church and create a completely new civilization that belongs to other existential level.

That all was and is the normal world vision of Christian Orthodoxy. It was preserved much more in the Eastern Church. In Byzantine tradition, in Orthodoxy, it is still normal. So if we come to Mount Athos and speak with the monks (for the man it's possible to come to Mount Athos, for women not) we could find exactly the people with the same consciousness. They will repeat exactly what I have said today and that is normative world vision of Orthodoxy; the meaning of the Katehon, the meaning of the sacred Roman Empire, the concept of the Church and God and dignity of man, a fight against evil, against Satan, against daemons. What normally the monks of Mount Athos do there is they fight. They are fighting against demons day and night. They are in fight. And that's concrete. And if we are reading Paisios from Mount Athos, we see that the fight obtains physical dimensions as well. It is a physical fight, a struggle against the powers of darkness. It still continues in Mount Athos. It still continues in politics (we will see it later). But what is important is that we have a complete world vision with all aspects of normative laws and relations between man and nature, political laws, social laws, based on Christian teaching. So Christian teaching is not only Church, not only cult and worship. It is world vision. It includes political normative ideas. It includes a kind of Monarchism, inner, embedded. You could not be normally democrat and be Christian. You should be in some way, in that context you should recognize the validity of teaching of the Katehon. It is not a preference or political opinion that you could form basing on your own position. It is the Orthodox point of view. And that is obligatory in some way. That is Indo-European root of Christianity. As well, we have some norms, some social relations, gender relations, family relations that are normative and Christian and that reflect this complete world vision. So Christianity is much more than cult, worship, and Church. That is, we could say, ideology, or Indo-European world vision, in new and actual form that lasts still up to today. When we have Christian Church with normal traditional priests and parish and normal man, we have the same today. Today, in Russia, in Mount Athos, in Serbia, in Bulgaria, in Macedonia, in Romania, in Ukraine, in Greece where there is traditional Orthodoxy, we have the same vision, culture, and civilization.

That was as well the case for the Latin Church but with much more accent on the power of spiritual authority over Emperor. But there was, after Charles the Great, as well (in our eyes), usurpation of the identity or the status of the sacred Emperor by Charles the Great. And that was the split in Catholic tradition between Emperor and Pope of Rome. But the dominating tendency in Catholicism was much more opposition between two kingdoms, formulated in Saint Augustine who was Manichean. The idea

that the Pope of Rome is representing of the spiritual is vertical as well (but once more Indo-European, everything is Indo-European). Verticality was represented by Rome and the kings were not sacred. That was the idea that the Roman sacred Pope should rule over purely secular kings. But with the institution usurped (in our eyes), by Charles the Great, that was as well the figure of Emperor. That was reflected in the Ghibelline tradition (the fight of the Guelphs against the Ghibellines in Western history). So there was as well a kind of Katehon for them. And this Katehonian Western Christian tradition lasted up to the Habsburg, up to the Austrian Empire. So the Habsburg Emperors were considered to be continuators of this Katehonian function. So, this was Austrian Empire in the Catholic version.

We didn't recognize the status of Charles the Great. We had at the time Byzantine Empress Irene. And that was the anti-feminist move of the Catholics. They considered that the woman cannot rule a sacred Empire and that is why they have appropriated the title of the Emperor in the case of Charles the Great (Charlemagne). But at the same time, we don't speak about who was right. We are speaking about how structurally that worked and functioned. And that concept of this sacred Emperor was certified from the beginning of the 9th century in the Emperor tradition of the Kings of Frank. And after that the Habsburg and Austrian Empire was the last moment of this Western Katehonian tradition. That was the kind of emperor line. It was not so much accepted by Popes of Rome but what is interesting is that it was nevertheless recognized by Catholics and by Guelphs as well (with not such interpretation as in the case of Ghibellines). Guelphs (the partisans of the absolute power of the Pope of Rome over secular Kings of Western Europe), in their tradition, recognized the status of the Emperor as a Katehonian figure (not so clearly, but recognized). So that was interesting that the Western Church as well recognized that.

So we had two versions of Christian civilizations - Eastern that is closer to the original version, with all the proportions conserved up to now. That was a kind of uninterrupted tradition of this Indo-European heritage coming to Christianity from Hellenism as I have explained, and fixed in the form of seven Ecumenical Councils. And there was much more, I would say, contradictory Western Christian tradition but in the same limits. And Catholicism has conserved that almost up to the Second Vatican Council. After that began a kind of collapse of Western Christianity. But nevertheless there was a kind of a continuation of tradition. So Catholicism and Austrian Empire were two forces of this Christian conservatism, of this middle ages tradition of Western Europe.

The collapse came with Protestantism. Protestantism was the third form. That concerned only Western Christianity. In order to think about Protestantism, this third branch of Christianity, we need to put ourselves not with the context of Orthodox against Catholic but Catholic against something else (so take Orthodox out of the picture. They didn't participate in anything in that conflict). It is interesting that at the origins of the Protestantism, we could find very very correct ideas. First of all, there is the idea that the Roman Church is totally corrupted and has usurped relations between the man and Christ. That was reflected in the concept of what is the Church in Catholicism. For Catholics, the Church is the community

of the priests. And what are the other Christians? They are semi, quasi, almost-Christians. They were a kind of outside circle around the Church and not inside the Church. That is very very important. For us, it's strange because the dogmatic Orthodox understanding of what is Church is that it is the community of all baptized people. So not only priests but as well any Christians. Church is the community of the baptized Christians, not only priests. Catholic tradition was quite different. There was a kind of hierarchy but in a spiritual sense. There was a hierarchy that interrupted direct relations between man, the ordinary Christian with God that should pass through priests and through the Pope of Rome. That was a kind of intermediary obstacle. Maybe that was necessary, maybe not. We don't speak about good or bad. We try to understand or describe it structurally. But nevertheless there was a kind of interruption between the relations of man and God.

The early Protestants, and above all, the German mystics (Meister Eckhart, Heinrich Seuse, and at a lesser scale Albertus Magnus) affirmed that there should be inner relation between the heart of the man with the Christ. It should not pass through exterior relations. For us there is no problem because in Orthodox tradition we recognize both. We recognize completely the authority of the Church and completely this direct relationship because we have the other concept of the Church. For us, the problem could not exist because we could not understand that. In our situation, there is no split. There are both. We have both ways - inner and outer. But for Western Christian tradition, there was a problem. And the first pre-Protestant mystics said 'good, let us accept the outer exterior form but let us proceed in an inner way.' And they were Platonic because they said that we have the direct relations with God and God could speak inside of us and that is our inner dimension. So they were purely Christian. In our situation they were closer to Orthodox in some ways. There were excesses, as well, of Platonism. For example, Meister Eckhart said that there is something beyond the Trinity, unity beyond the Trinity. That is not too much Orthodox. But nevertheless the main idea was so. This radical subject concept, the concept of the inner self that is living in the heart, and the 'inner Christ' as they called it was at the origin of Protestantism (in Wycliffe, Hussites, Czechs, German mystics). So that was legitimate up to some point.

But when they tried to oppose this teaching with Luther and Calvin to Catholic tradition they had lost the tradition itself. They have lost icons, monks, monasteries, and Church as such. Trying to clear the direct access from man to God, they destroyed the sacredness. And they took what we could call radical subject (the inner self that is living inside of our soul) and replaced that with normal individuality, with profane individuality. So that was a kind of religious individualism instead of this mystical dimension. Because when Protestantism began to expand itself, it appealed to the masses that could not have this special inner experience. And that was full perversion. That was destruction of Christianity. Because from the legitimate starting point of the early Protestantism or maybe pre-Protestant mysticism of Wycliffe or European Platonists, that was a kind of destruction of the traditional Catholic society. And that was Titanic.

There is an inner self that is divine. But if we affirm not this radical interiority, where in the center of our heart Christ lives, and shift to the exterior aspect instead of the real subject (radical subject), we are receiving positive subject. This is not the third man in the mystical language of Johannes Tauler. He has said there are three men in one of us. There is the man as beast (that is exterior), the rational man (second man), and there is hidden mysterious secret man inside of us (that is radical subject) and it is he who has relations with God. It is mystery man (third man) inside of us, inside of inside. It is not only inside of body but inside of the soul. It is the mysterious point that is hidden in our mind. This third man and second man (rational man) are not the same. They are in opposition. And the first mystics defended this third man (hidden secret mystery man). And normal Protestantism made a shift from the third man to the second man. They affirmed the dignity of something that shouldn't have such dignity because there is no possible direct relation between second man (rational man, positive subject) and God. It should always have some intermediary. Direct relation is impossible. And the pretension to have such relation is purely titanic.

So that was transformation of the Logos in that. In the early Protestantism was a kind of legitimate claim to have relations between third man (hidden man inside of us) and God. And in the normal, profane Protestantism there was a completely different approach. That was fatal and that was the destruction of traditional society because of this titanism appearing in Lutheran teaching but above all in Calvinism. Calvinism is much worse than Lutheranism. Calvinism is radical absence of any sacredness in the world. It is glorification of the second man as the only one. It is profane and destruction of sacredness. That was the premise for the occasion of Modern post-Christian civilization. Protestantism was the break in the great wall of Christian civilization. That was the destruction of Western Christian tradition.

In order to prepare for the next lecture about Noological analysis of Modernity, we could make a very short analysis of what is dechristianization of modern society. That was destruction of Logos of Apollo and Logos of Dionysus. That was destruction of Indo-European heritage. That was not only an exchange or replacement of one religion (Christian religion) by secular version. That was a catastrophe that is much deeper than only the fall of Christianity. That was the fall of the Logos that was ours before Christianity. That was destruction of all form of verticality. That was the real coming of anti-Christ, liberation of Satan from the chains of Hell, and eruption, intervention, invasion of Titanic power in existential horizon of European culture. So now we could evaluate what was done with Protestantism and dechristianization. So that is new moment of Noomahia because Noomahia had the same moment (the victory of the Logos of Apollo with the Logos of Dionysus against the Logos of Cybele.) That was the beginning of our civilization. That was the first chart. That was the first basic event. That was a kind of reign. We lived during thousands of years, basing on this moment of Noomahia, having contradictory existential horizons inside of our society, but lived in the victory of light over darkness. And that didn't begin with Christianity. That continued with Christianity. We were happy during many thousands of

years, being the sons of the light to live in the kingdom of light, with all the problems, with all the dramatic aspects, all the Dionysian aspects, dying, resurrecting, being destroyed and winning anew our Noomahia, our battles. With the dechristianization came something absolutely radical from a Noological and geosophical point of view. We are going to see what in the next lecture.

Introduction to Noomakhia (lecture 8) Modernity

Primary tabs

[View\(active tab\)](#) [What links here](#)

Alexander Dugin

Lecture 8 is dedicated to noological analysis of the modernity. I presume that now it is more or less easy to anticipate what will be the result of this analysis. First of all, I would suggest the reading of the traditionalist school's very important others such as Rene Guenon, Julius Evola, Titus Burckhardt, Frithjof Schuon, Michel Valsan, or Hossein Nasr who have explained that the modernity is a special concept. So modernity is not something that has to deal with contemporarity. Because now in the contemporary actual moment we could have modern society, pre-modern society, post-modern society, archaic society, society with religion, middle ages type of society but living in today's world. So contemporary does not mean modern. That is a very important aspect and conceptual element. So when we speak about modernity, we don't speak about what exists now. It is a description of a type of society, of structure, of existential horizon, of civilization that is a little bit a-temporal. So we could imagine modernity now. We could imagine modernity belonging to the past or belonging to the future. That is already very important.

So we consider the modernity not as the fate 'cause we have it now and we will have it tomorrow, and we are obliged to be modern' and so on. Traditionalists affirm that to be modern is a decision. You can be modern or you can be not modern. And they have created two concepts - the tradition and the modernity. So modernity is not something actual. That is a kind of society or civilization or world vision or picture of the reality. That is one thing. And there is tradition. That is the picture of reality, the civilization, the culture, and the society that is different. And between them, affirmed the traditionalists, there is antagonism. That is very important because that gives us the possibility to study modernity not as something inevitable but as something that is the product of concrete historical development based on concrete sequence of decisions and choices.

And the modernity is artificial, I would say. It was artificially created. It is not something that went by itself. Modernity is not natural. Modernity was created, is supported, is defended, is adjusted, and is developed. But there is a kind of free will behind the modernity that is not fatality. There is not mechanical law of modernity, because we know many societies that are not modern. For example, there is Islamic society, Indian society in some aspects, archaic society, which are not modern. They exist today. And if we consider the majority of mankind and humanity today in 21st century, they live not in the modern society. The society they belong to is traditional society. Modernity has something to do with contemporary world but we should understand that separately from contemporary.

We could speak about structure of modernity. Modernity is something structural, constructed, and could and should be deconstructed. Postmodernist philosophy is based precisely on this deconstruction of modernity with their special aspects. But that is possible. And deconstruction of modernity (and that is crucial point in noology) could be made from 2 positions. Deconstruction of modernity could be made by postmodernists with their hyper-modern ethics. The majority of postmodernists are disappointed with the modernity because modernity didn't fulfill its promises, doesn't satisfy them, their hopes and anticipations. So that is a kind of despair. They're in despair that modernity couldn't accomplish the goal that it declared. So that is post-modernity in the sense that modernity is too small, is not enough. And they try to deconstruct modernity in order to show that it should be overcome in order to create what modernity wanted to do but couldn't accomplish by inner limitations. In the eyes of post-modernists, the modernity was too traditional, excessively traditional. Modernity could not overcome tradition, but it should and it shall with the post-modernity. So that is a kind of deconstruction of modernity that shows that modernity was not so much modern as it needed to be in the eyes of post-modernist ethic. But what is interesting in this method, in doing that they show the artificial nature of modernity, that modernity is a creation, that modernity is based on the decision. So we could deconstruct something that something has constructed. So we can use some methods of post-modernity precisely dealing with modernity.

But what is much more important is the other possibility to deconstruct the modernity in much more radical way than post-modernist critics. That is traditionalism that regards the modernity as a kind of the type of the structure that was created against the tradition. So that is consideration of modernity as anti-tradition. It could be represented as a kind of reversal of all traditional values. And what was in the traditional society with the sign plus in the modernity is minus. So that is a kind of reversal of the traditional state of things. And that was based on decision, subversion, and the will to destroy and to exchange the thesis with anti-thesis in some way. So modernity is anti-thesis for tradition. That is traditionalist position. And what is interesting is that post-modernists agree with the goal of modernity. So they criticize modernity as something not enough, something not sufficient. But traditionalist criticize the modernity as something awful, as something completely negative, as nihilism, as destruction, as perversion, as subversion, as daemonic design of reality or as a kind of anti-Christ civilization created by the conscious partisans of Satan. So the modernity in the eyes of traditionalists is conscious satanic creation. So there is traditional divine society, divine world, and divine soul and there is satanic tradition, satanic order, satanic cosmos and so on.

That is very interesting because this kind of deconstruction of modernity exists as well, including in our world. And we could use both in order to deal with modernity. We could have deconstruction from the left (postmodern deconstruction) with elaborated methodology with traditionalist deconstruction. I don't insist now on who is right. I try to show that there are two possibilities to deal with modernity

outside of the pretensions of modernity, because modernity says 'oh, that is necessary, that's mechanical law of development, the progress, the man is good, the man is developing, the progress is inevitable' and so on. All that is questioned by post-modernity and all this is questioned by traditionalism. If we unite both criticisms, methodologically we obtain something completely new. So we see, joining both methodologies, at least one thing for certain - that we are dealing with something absolutely artificial, because both criticisms show that with all the power of persuasion of scientific expression from different positions and that is very important. So we could regard the modernity as something conceptual, structural, and in some way eternal. So modernity exists, not only in contemporary world, but it is structure. If we could describe the modernity with mathematical, for example structures, values and anti-values, plus and minus, if we could have a kind of formula of modernity, it could not be contemporary. So this formula could exist in a different context. So that opens to us the way to analyze the modernity as something that could be turned from the contemporary moment. That is very important. So we could study modernity as we are studying for example Chinese culture or Roman culture in the same way. That is something that is accomplished but that belongs to some eternal text. We could choose different scales; we could go closer or go further from modernity. So modernity is the object of the study.

When we try to concretize in noomahia perspective what is modernity, we have already spoken about that it is anti-Christianism. Because we had in our European history tradition, about which traditionalists speak, in the form of Christian tradition. And we have shown in the previous lecture, how this Christian tradition included in itself pre-Christian structures and Indo-European Logos. So tradition now, in this noological version, is the same as Christianity but at the same time is the same as the alliance between Logos of Apollo with Logos of Dionysus in concrete historical Christian form. So that was and is tradition that we could identify and as well describe as type. So if we have this concrete and positive description of what is tradition, it is not something vague. It is concrete. It is Logos of Apollo with its structure, its symmetry, verticality with Logos of purified Apollonian Dionysus in the case of dialectic embedded in this version. So everything is quite concrete.

And we try for example to deny all that, to make a kind of reversal of that. We receive the other type - no Apollo, no Dionysus. And now it is not only nihilism or destruction or parody (as traditionalists say) but in our noological analysis, we see clearly what is so called positive content of modernity. So the modernity is not only destruction, the chaos, the anti, anti, anti, against, against, against. It is not nihilism. In the eyes of Logos of Apollo, there is no Logos of Cybele. There is nothing. There is destruction, matter. But in three Logos concept of noomahia, there is Logos of Cybele. There is a kind of structure that we could imagine, that we could describe with positive inner relations. That is why noomahia noology is so important now, because thanks to noomahia we have the key to deeper and the better understanding on what is modernity. Because when traditionalists criticize the modernity, they use negative terms. That is 'overthrow of the traditional values, negative, nihilism.' That is conservative discourse. They belong to tradition, to the Logos of Apollo and Dionysus and they consider the end of

BERSERKER

BOOKS

